

## Amendment C375 Summary of Standard Submissions and Response

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
1	P. Alexander	Carr Street Barwon Heads	O	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Barwon River Estuary and lower river reaches constitutes the southern most exposed and fragile marine mangroves system on mainland Australia. All these sensitive systems need far more care and protection: not ravaging and over development.</li> <li>2. There is already a loss of character of Barwon Heads as a coastal village through a wanton spread of over development and the care of this village is not reflected in the planning scheme Amendment C375.</li> <li>3. Blanket application of IHDA (Increased Housing Diversity Area) is quite inappropriate for Barwon Heads.</li> <li>4. Barwon Heads has NOT been designated as a Growth Area.</li> <li>5. DDO (Design and Development Overlay) as proposed is most ineffective.</li> <li>6. The height of future apartments and buildings would be far too high at 11 metres.</li> <li>7. Council rates are prohibitively high, so much so that elderly, pensioner, frail residents, to whom Barwon Heads is home, have been forced to sell out and leave.</li> <li>8. It would seem that for Barwon Heads to remain part of Greater Geelong and to attract such high rates is an unsound practice.</li> </ol>	<p>IHDA Settlement Boundary Drafting Village Character</p> <p>Council rates are not a relevant planning consideraton for Amendment C325.</p>
2	J. Almond	Warrenbeen Crt Barwon Heads	O	<p>I strongly oppose the introduction of a 4,000 sqm minimum subdivision to Warrenbeen Court.</p> <p>The covenant on my land which I purchased in 1999 is set to expire in 2020. With this knowledge it has always been my intent to subdivide my land at 12-13 Warrenbeen Court into two tittles (12 and 13). If it was the intention of the town planners to preserve Warrenbeen in its natural state a planning permit to allow for residential development and subdivision should never have been approved. This amendment is retrospective, it discriminates against me and is bad town planning as it is a back zoning.</p> <p>The Environmental Significance Overlay is not an appropriate way to manage a residential area. This overlay in conjunction with my building envelope is restrictive and unreasonable, with no provision for works outside of this envelope for things like carports, driveways, chook pens and ornamental gardens, including the ongoing maintenance of these works already completed. Therefore I strongly oppose the introduction of this overlay.</p> <p>In summary I will be left vulnerable, I will be disadvantaged and I will be discriminated against if these amendments are introduced.</p>	Warrenbeen Crt
3	W. Amor	Thomson Drive Barwon Heads	O	Submission outlining the following Objections:	IHDA Settlement Boundary

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>1: Barwon Heads (BH) is a unique coastal village, surrounded by protected wetlands, the Barwon River and the Sea. This town offers many outdoor activities-sporting, sailing, fishing, surfing, cycling to name a few. Residents and visitors also have the opportunity to admire the parachutists in the distance above the BH airstrip! The City of Greater Geelong promotes the Cadel Evans Bike ride in January and the Victoria Open Golf tournament held at the 13th Beach Resort in February. BH has a key role in these events with the spectacle for national television coverage as the riders pass through plus offering accommodation and a choice of eating venues. I also must note the recent report/promotion of the BH Golf Club on Fox Sport Golf Show. The above events and the Golf Club attract many, many visitors to BH and add to the economy of the City of Geelong. BH has a village seaside feel, with amenities within a comfortable walking / cycling distance for residents and visitors. The walks can be along the wetlands park area, up to the Bluff and along the seaside. The camping ground offers prime positions for those who choose to stay in cabins or in tents along the shore line. The wetlands, rivers system and the seaside are pristine environments well maintained by the Coastal department and supported by the local Barwon Coast Committee of Management. The local community respects and is vigilant in protecting the environment.</p> <p>2: The Bellarine Peninsula is one of 5 areas in Victoria considered a unique environmental area. BH is not a designated growth area and not a light industrial area. There is not a transport hub in the town. There is a limited bus service to Geelong. The Geelong Road is becoming more congested, carrying more Movement. The main road through the town passes through the centre of BH due to the position of the bridge. Trucks have to negotiate a 90 degree turn at the primary school and 3 roundabouts. There is not an alternative route and clearly a safety risk to other Movement, including cyclists and pedestrians. Future planning must consider pedestrian safety in the central commercial area. Consideration for Movement flow and the appropriate placement of pedestrian crossings should be reviewed. The local primary school has 492 pupils in 2018. This demonstrates the demographics of BH has changed with more young families living in the town. There are limited car parking areas which is evident in the busy 2 months of the year. BH, however, now is busy most weekends throughout the year. With growth areas such as Warralily, more people are coming to BH to enjoy the environment and spending family time along the river and play grounds, for example. Developments must have adequate parking for at least 2 parking spaces for each residential construction/ apartment. I am concerned when there is heavy rain and with high groundwater level, underground parking cause flooding within and into neighbouring properties.</p> <p>3: There seem to be conflicting plans for the development of Barwon Heads. The settlement boundary as outlined should be retained as noted in the BH Structure Plan. This will help protect</p>	<p>Drafting Movement &amp; Parking Village Character</p>

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>the wetlands and our significant landscape. As noted above we do not have the infrastructure to support further population growth at this stage in BH.</p> <p>I support the proposed residential zone and overlay changes in Areas 1, 2, 3, 5 &amp; 6. In Area 4, the buildings are similar to those in Area 1. Is this change only because Area 4 is 400 metres from the main street? The planning footprint almost seems haphazard with the area along the west side of Golf Links Road included in Area 4 and some areas between Ozone Road and Geelong Road included in Area 4 and others in Area 1. Surely Area 4 could be within Bridge Road, Golf Links Road, Ozone Road and Flinders Parade. To retain the coastal village, 11 meter height construction is too high. These heights are not suited to a low lying coastal area. With construction allowed on front boundaries there is no room for vegetation.</p> <p>There should be advertising/notification of proposed construction planning to neighbours. Third party appeal rights should not be waived. This allows for orderly, democratic planning. Community input is important. I do not support the possibility that commercial enterprises could be developed within 100 metres of the Ozone Road, Hitchcock Avenue intersection.</p> <p>In summary, BH is a unique seaside village with special protected environmental features, as noted above, situated between designated growth areas to the East and the West. BH adds significantly to the City of Greater Geelong economy. The views of the BH community should be thoughtfully considered.</p>	
4	R. Anderson	George Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>Objects to proposed Area 5 changes – reduction of height limit from 10.5m to 9m and site coverage from 70% to 40%. The submission says that these changes are ridiculous and completely impractical to building a new house: ‘we do not understand the thought process especially to the site coverage issue’.</p>	South of Bridge Rd
5	S. Anthony	Warrenbeen Crt Barwon Heads	O	<p>I strongly oppose the changing of the zoning in Warrenbeen Court, Barwon Heads from its existing zoning to the C375 Scheme Amendment.</p> <p>As I understand it, and as per the contract that I signed for 21-22 Warrenbeen Court, Barwon Heads on 30/06/2000, the covenant on this land expires on 31 December 2020 leaving this property covenant and restriction free. To my knowledge, this is the understanding of all the residents in Warrenbeen Court.</p> <p>With this knowledge it has always been my intent to subdivide my land at 21-22 Warrenbeen Court into two titles (21 &amp; 22). There is no reason why lots in Warrenbeen Court would not be able to support more than one lot subdivision, for instance, whilst still maintaining their existing street character and style it may be that 1500 - 2000 sqm is more appropriate.</p>	Warrenbeen Crt

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>The fact that the original Warrenbeen site was approved for subdivision by COGG planning in the first place, with a time limit on it, displays that further subdivision after 2020 was the original intention and that the restrictive covenant was in place to guide the initial development only. This is further supported by the current zoning, which will provide for control of incremental development beyond the life of the development.</p> <p>I believe the proposed amendment is retrospective, it discriminates against me, is poor town planning and demonstrates back zoning of the area. This retrospective Planning Scheme will leave us disadvantaged, discriminated against and is in breach of the original contract that we signed.</p> <p>Therefore I strongly oppose to the introduction of this overlay as this land should be totally covenant and restriction free as per the contract we signed.</p>	
6	N. Armytage	Billyanco, 4144 Conargo Rd. Deniliquin NSW	O	<p>The submitter owns a property on Von Nida Avenue and strongly objects, saying:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building heights in the GRZ should remain at 11m</li> <li>• Devaluing the area</li> <li>• Wants to demolish house and rebuild with modern ceiling heights (2.74m)</li> <li>• The exterior of the building will have little or no gable to fit requirements</li> <li>• Too late to protect town centre traditional scaled buildings</li> <li>• Movement and parking is a problem in Area 4</li> <li>• The house at 54 Golf Links Rd is a good example of an attractive, ageless house</li> </ul>	<p>NRZ Movement &amp; Parking</p> <p>Potential impact (positive or negative) to property values resulting from Am C375 is not a relevant planning matter. This position has been clearly expressed in numerous planning panel reports.</p>
7	S. Austin	Hogan Drive Barwon Heads	O	<p>I am very concerned about the rate and type of development which is resulting in a loss of the coastal village character and sense of place that defines BH as a small coastal village which is not a growth area.</p>	Village Character
8	G. Bade	Barnett Close Barwon Heads	O	<p>Generally, the Structure Plan is reasonably acceptable when planning of the village has aims of enhancing the importance of the ecology of the Bellarine Peninsula and the need to protect Barwon Heads from inappropriate urban encroachment.</p> <p>Statements of maintaining and protecting the "unique character of Barwon Heads as a coastal village located within a sensitive environment and significant landscape settings" or "ensure the streetscape and character in heritage areas is maintained", or "ensure the development makes a positive architectural and urban design contribution" all sound hollow and will not be maintained if Barwon Heads has Increased Housing Diversity Areas (IHDA) within the planning scheme.</p>	IHDA Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>The implementation of IHDA is not suited to Barwon Heads as it is not a designated growth area in the Greater Geelong area. Barwon Heads is surrounded by major growth areas at Ocean Grove and Armstrong Creek.</p> <p>The planning of Barwon Heads would be enhanced by altering the Area 4 RGZ Schedule 3 to that of Area 1 GRZ Schedule 2. This would virtually give Barwon Heads a uniform Residential Zone with building height of 9 metres height limit and private open space area requirements for new development.</p> <p>Please consider this Zone Change from RGZ to GRZ as a practical objective to maintain the living style and character of Barwon Heads.</p>	
9	J. Bade	Barnett Close Barwon Heads	O	<p>The submission makes the following objections and comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BH is not a designated growth zone</li> <li>• The IHDA should not be applied to BH and the 11 height limit will destroy the village character</li> <li>• Large trees and protected vegetation will be lost</li> <li>• Destruction of entrance to BH from Ocean Grove</li> <li>• The residents of BH are not being heard by the planning department on heights</li> <li>• No attempt to protect the coastal character and lot sizes</li> <li>• Total lack of pedestrian linkages through town</li> <li>• Underground car parks will damage water table</li> <li>• DDO42 does not supply any information but appears to allow open slather</li> <li>• Developers must not be encouraged by providing parking waivers</li> <li>• Town Centre not included in structure plan</li> </ul>	<p>IHDA Village Character Movement &amp; Parking Drafting NRZ Vegetation Protection</p>
10	P. Bade (Petition organiser)	Barnett Close Barwon Heads	O	<p>This submission is a petition with 24 signatures. The submission states:</p> <p>We, the undersigned residents of Barwon Heads, request the removal of the extension of the General Residential Zone from the west side of Golf Links Rd. This random strip of GRZ on the west side of Golf Links Rd extends a part of Area 4 into Areas 1 and 2.</p> <p>This random strip on the west side has the capacity to encourage significant <i>re-development</i> which is not in keeping with <i>the</i> housing which is there and is in conflict with the "coastal" character of Barwon Heads. It will have a significant impact on this western part of the village, which is already impacted by the school and heavy Movement along Golf Links Road.</p> <p>The inclusion of this area as GRZ is not suitable for the following reasons:</p>	<p>IHDA Village Character</p> <p><u>Note:</u> all Am C375 correspondence will go to P. Bade as the petition organiser.</p> <p>The submission is supported and the GRZ on the west side of Golf Links Rd will be replaced</p>

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barwon Heads, according to Clause 21.06 of the GGPS and the G21 Regional Growth Plan is not a designated growth area and therefore not subject to the Increased Housing Diversity Area (GRZ) as stated in Area 4 of proposed Amendment C375.</li> <li>• Development will have a significant negative impact on surrounding properties and the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• The close proximity to the school means that this area is already managing significant conflicts regarding Movement, parking and pedestrian activity.</li> <li>• 11m is too high in the context of mainly single level dwellings in this part of Barwon Heads. Clause 22.14 states Objectives of protecting the character of Barwon Heads as a coastal village located within a sensitive environment and significant landscape setting. Impossible if dwellings all go to 11 m.</li> <li>• DD042 is drafted to enable larger scale buildings and developments and provides no protections for this neighbourhood or the coastal amenity.</li> <li>• There is no benefit to the liveability or diversity of Barwon Heads to have this orphan zoning on the western side. Golf Links Road is a major entrance to Barwon Heads and the present character of the street will be destroyed and overwhelmed if 11-meter-high buildings dominate the street scape, hardly creating the appearance of a coastal village, ref Clause 22.14 and 22.36.</li> <li>• This zoning entices Objection and frustration among residents who already feel overwhelmed and abandoned by authorities who are employed and paid to represent and protect their interests. The zoning allows developers a free hand to completely alienate locals and cause conflict with neighbours.</li> <li>• The Neighbourhood Residential Zone NRZ schedule 6 still encourages development of a significant height and density and DD041 is more than adequate to encourage development and protect existing amenity.</li> </ul> <p>We, the undersigned, therefore request for a change from General Residential Zone to Neighbourhood Residential Zone for the west side of Golf Links Road.</p>	with the NRZ. Refer to the report for further discussion.
11	J. Baensch	Geelong Road Barwon Heads	O	<p>My Objection to the increased building heights C375</p> <p>As a rate payer member of Barwon heads community I spend a lot of time walking around Barwon heads and in my 10 years living here it saddens me to see the changes that are happening weekly now. Buildings are being knocked down, trees cut down, and massive unattractive units and shops, as many as can fit on a block are being built with no thought for the importance of maintaining a coastal village character, we are losing our sense of place and our cultural identity</p>	IHDA Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>and consequential loss of heritage and neighbourhood character</p> <p>Barwon Heads is not a designated growth zone. We need a Structure Plan that will actually work and protect us. Large parts of old Barwon Heads are vulnerable to ad hoc large-scale development. Our coastal &amp; river setting is our most precious asset. Ironically the most intense development is proposed for its vicinity, and in the oldest part of Barwon Heads where our coastal heritage is valued most. Personally I have seen mother possums carrying babies with no place to live walking along our fence, because the house over our fence was being knocked down to build two massive units which meant even fence line trees needed to be cut down, I have a child that I am bringing up here and it worries me that this will not be a place I would want to continue to do this.</p> <p>I ask you please consider the environment and people in Barwon heads and an intimate community which supports all age groups and provides a place of belonging for residents and visitors alike, and not just see the dollar value of the rates these high density buildings will bring.</p>	
12	M. Banks	Henderson Ave Malvern VIC 3144	S	<p>Supports the Amendment for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in height and site coverage, and maintaining the town boundary, is consistent with maintaining the village atmosphere.</li> <li>Ample new housing land is available along Barwon Heads Rd.</li> </ul>	Support noted
13	Barwon Heads Assoc Inc.	S. Gatehouse President, BHA Barnett Close Barwon Heads	O	<p>The BHA lodged two separate submissions:</p> <p><u>Barwon Heads Structure Plan 2017 Submission</u></p> <p>We thank CoGG and the Strategic Planning team for the time and resources they have put into this process. The community feels listened to and involved in this review process; however it is apparent we haven't been heard on a number of matters.</p> <p>Until phrases like 'coastal character' in planning documents, and the Design and Development Overlays become more prescriptive, the Structure Plan is a weak document, which lacks direction. Especially for the planners who will rely on it for decision-making. The DDO's are just a ragbag of requirements, with no specific mention of quality design, materials, form or colours. The failure to define minimum lot sizes is of considerable concern.</p> <p>We also try to understand the power of the Building Surveyor, which in this context is considerable, especially where there are no triggers for advertising. There are no "coastal design benchmarks" for the Building Surveyors to measure against, and little to link this decision making model back to the Structure Plan and the vision for Barwon Heads. The Council happily abdicates any role it might have to the Surveyors, who are in the main disconnected and totally</p>	<p>IHDA Settlement Boundary Drafting Movement &amp; Parking South of Bridge Rd Warrenbeen Crt NRZ Vegetation Protection Village Character</p> <p>Council committed substantial resources and effort on community engagement and acknowledgement from the BHA is appreciated. The assertion that the community has not been</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>disinterested in local and coastal amenity.</p> <p>The Plan encourages buildings of 11 metres in height and waived parking, and has limited design requirements. By its indifference to what actually matters in 'coastal character,' this ensures that Barwon Heads will become an ugly mismatch of styles often discordant or urbanised and very far from what is generally recognised as 'coastal character.'</p> <p>The submission provides the following specific responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We... are concerned that the Hansen Barwon Heads Residential &amp; Landscape Character Assessment excluded consideration of the commercial and mixed use areas along and around Hitchcock Avenue.</li> <li>• The Plan does nothing to encourage the provision of adaptable housing designs to support lifetime home living for older people, and this reference should be removed.</li> <li>• The need for better co-ordination with public landowners and agencies was recently highlighted with the advertising process for the new Ozone Rd stormwater drain that CoGG has now built into the Barwon River.</li> <li>• We strongly support the protection and enhancement of the Coastal Moonah Woodland Community of the Warrenbeen Court area and the rural land north of Tait's Rd.</li> <li>• The plan identifies flooding and stormwater as significant issues. We are not convinced that adequate consideration has been given to the impact of growth especially in the IHDA zone, to permeability and stormwater runoff. The new drain and the 60% site occupancy will not go far enough to protect the town. This is acknowledged in the Structure Plan.</li> <li>• The decision to retain the existing settlement boundary at its current location and not to expand on the western edge of the township is strongly supported.</li> <li>• We will request the Panel to consider and support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reduction of the IHDA to 100m from the current commercial zone and rezone the remainder neighbourhood residential zone with a mandatory height limit of 9m to reflect the coastal design character of the town and maintain the town character. Do not extend IHDA beyond Ozone Road.</li> <li>○ Introduction of advertising for single dwellings as a precautionary measure to enable the orderly planning for Barwon Heads.</li> <li>○ DDO 42 should follow the same format of DDO 41 and include a section for site coverage 60%.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The Plan acknowledges the increased risk of flooding through the pressures caused by infill development within 400m of the town centre. Our request to reduce the IHDA area will contribute to also reducing this risk.</li> </ul>	<p>'heard' is rejected and the BHSP stands as an informed strategic planning document underpinned by current policy.</p> <p>Building surveyors are governed by the Building Regulations. Where a Class 10 building design does not comply with a Building Regulations standard, the reporting authority (i.e. usually Council) may give consent to an application for a building permit. The assessment includes character and amenity considerations. Neighbouring properties are involved via a 'report &amp; consent' process. A planning permit may or may not be required in addition to a building permit.</p> <p>The 'new drain' was completed in January 2018 by Council engineers.</p> <p>A number of sections in the BHSP refer to the Town Centre. The 2003</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are very concerned that developments, which include basement parking, will cause considerable impacts on the neighbouring areas and impact the shallow water table, building foundations and neighbouring properties. This should be prohibited.</li> <li>• We request that Council urgently undertake such further assessment of significant trees on private land (as well as public land) in Barwon Heads as may be necessary to inform and support imposing planning or other legal control of the removal of significant trees and vegetation from private land to preserve the landscape character of the township.</li> <li>• We note that the Housing Diversity Strategy 2008 and the Parking &amp; Movement Study 2010 are both dated, and rely on data which has not considered the impact of significant population growth and increase of Movement, pedestrians and cyclists. Both studies should be reviewed and updated or the process started again. The Structure Plan should be informed by current data, that the Planners and the Community can rely on not data from the early 2000's.</li> <li>• 10.5m in the town centre going up to 11m in the GRZ then back down to 9m. This is a deviation from fundamental planning principles associated with strategic planning of built form.</li> <li>• In respect to Clause 21.14 "maintain a compact urban form and avoid outward sprawl by ensuring that urban development does not occur outside of the defined settlement boundary, suggest adding <i>"and increased height and density is contained in the immediate Hitchcock Ave precinct."</i></li> <li>• NRZ to be amended to include a minimum lot size of no less than 400sqm.</li> <li>• DDO42 should be amended to include a height limit of 9m &amp; 60% site coverage.</li> <li>• Area 5 we support the removal of this area from the IHDA and the RGZ.</li> <li>• We are concerned that the scale of any development in the CZ1 and the Mixed Use Zone DDO25 reflect the coastal design character of Barwon Heads. It is certainly not apparent with current developments, and the main street is evolving as a miss-match of poorly designed buildings, with too many small shops and expensive holiday units. There is no sign of energy efficient design, retention of existing trees, or utilisation of setbacks for outdoor dining or displays. There is inadequate parking and no loading zones. This amendment does little if anything to address the urban design issues faced by the town, and should be re-considered.</li> </ul> <p><u>Movement &amp; Parking Response</u>  Movement and Parking, and the associated issues such as pedestrian amenity cause considerable friction in our town. The conflict between meeting an insatiable car parking demand needs to be balanced with maintaining our coastal village character and the informality of our local streets. The parking demand is constant and not only during peak</p>	Urban Design Framework provided a comprehensive analysis of the Town Centre which resulted in zone and overlay (DDO25) changes, and street works. Am C375 seeks a change to DDO25 to increase the height to 11m consistent with the surrounding proposed GRZ. It is noted that the current DDO25 supports '...generally restricting buildings to a maximum height of 2 storeys'.

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>holiday times.</p> <p>No major Movement and parking improvements are recommended in the BHSP2017. This is not acceptable. The only specific action committed to in the Plan is that CoGG will continue to monitor the parking situation and identify potential future infrastructure that could be undertaken subject to community feedback and budget availability. Again this is not acceptable.</p> <p><b>The BHA submission recommends that a commitment to undertake a Barwon Heads Movement and Parking Study as a matter of urgency be included in the BHSP.</b> This should include options identification, consultation and an implementation program for agreed actions. The BHA Parking sub-committee is committed to support the CoGG in undertaking this study. We will rely on this document to continue to lobby for a formal Movement and parking study and to change the attitude of CoGG to waiving valuable car parking.</p> <p>The submission provides the following specific responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The BHA does not agree that the problems are limited to a two month holiday season peak. These problems extend well beyond a two month peak period. We strongly believe that Movement and parking problems are serious issues throughout the year, are less seasonal now than five years ago, are worsening as the encroaching growth areas population grows and the visitor numbers increase.</li> <li>• We note that the largest study of 2007 was undertaken over a decade ago in March which the GTA report recognised was outside of the peak holiday season.</li> <li>• The 2010 GTA is not relevant to the current Movement and parking issues facing Barwon Heads.</li> <li>• BHA does not agree with the BHSP2017 inference that historical monitoring has been adequate.</li> <li>• Regarding the 'Principle' in Section 3.3.2: there is also a need for a parking principle.</li> <li>• A schedule is required to review Barwon Head's roads under CoGG responsibility, footpaths, and bicycle paths. This should include community consultation on works and funding mechanisms. It is not acceptable for the Barwon Heads community to wait for an undefined Council strategy or plan. The BHA is of the view that as this infrastructure would provide a broad regional benefit through visitations as well as a local benefit and hence the primary source of funding should be consolidated revenue rather than Special Rates and Charges.</li> <li>• A schedule is required to review Barwon Heads transport, parking and pedestrian and cycling network. This should include community consultation. It is not acceptable for the Barwon Heads community to wait for an undefined Council strategy or plan.</li> </ul>	

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration should also be given to the Movement management at the intersection of Hitchcock Avenue and Ozone Road where Movement volumes have increased significantly and there have been multiple accident near misses over the past year.</li> <li>• Regarding advocacy to VicRoads/Golf Links Rd, this should include consideration of other pedestrian crossings on Golf Links Road north of the school crossing.</li> <li>• BHA believes that the following parking improvement opportunities should be carefully considered in the new Barwon Heads Movement and Parking Study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ residential car parking permits to existing dwellings bordering the town centre (as provide in Ocean Grove and other parts of Geelong especially around the commercial areas);</li> <li>○ increase in timed parking spots including along Flinders Parade;</li> <li>○ park and ride opportunities;</li> <li>○ improved regulation of timed parking bays;</li> <li>○ more parking spots for buses;</li> <li>○ disabled parking;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In addition the following should be implemented immediately: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Effective enforce of current parking restrictions;</li> <li>○ Restrict parking waivers for new developments;</li> <li>○ Require Developers to include parking assessments taken over summer and weekends rather than mid-week in winter;</li> <li>○ Deny resident parking permits to new developments which seek waiver of parking and require disclosure at the time of sale; and</li> <li>○ Regular joint communiques by CoGG and BCCM on parking options.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
14	Barwon Water	P. Van Wyk Asset Planning Barwon Water 55-67 Ryrie Street Geelong VIC 3220	S	Barwon Water has no objections to the proposed changes and will not be making a submission regarding the changes.	Support noted
15	R. Bell	PO Box 1301 Geelong VIC 3220	O	<p>My Objection relates specifically to plans to rezone Area 5 south of Bridge Road, within which my property is situated, from Residential Growth Zone Schedule 3 to a new Neighbourhood Residential Zone.</p> <p>I believe the plan to reduce site coverage from the current 70% to 40% is overly restrictive on those of us who own property in this area. The proposal is unrealistic in that most of the properties in this area already have site coverage of more than 40%. On the attached aerial photograph that covers a large part of Area 5, 43 of 72 properties shown in this photograph have</p>	South of Bridge Rd

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>site coverage of more than 40%; with some appearing to cover more than 60% of the property area (especially in Campbell Street). The Barwon Heads Structure plan claims that site coverage for the majority of properties in Barwon Heads is 40%. This is clearly not the case for Area 5.</p> <p>To impose the 40% restriction on those of us who have not yet either built on our blocks or renovated our existing (often pre-1960s) buildings on them, is unfair and unreasonable, given the current built nature of the area.</p> <p>I would personally be impacted by the proposed zoning changes as I wish to build a house for a family of 5 (four bedrooms) on our block which has been in the family for over 60 years. Our block size is 300 sqm, so it would be very difficult to build a house to meet our housing needs if I am only able to cover 40% of the block.</p> <p>Barwon Heads is surrounded by sensitive wetland and coastal environments, so we agree with the proposal to “Maintain a compact urban form and avoid outward sprawl by ensuring that urban development does not occur outside of the defined settlement boundary. “</p> <p>However, we think it unrealistic to then seek to reduce build density within the town boundaries. This would effectively create an enclave where only the very wealthy will be able to afford to live – and I disagree with any policy that is socially in-equitable. In general, if restrictions are to be placed on town expansion beyond current boundaries, then planners must be prepared to allow for higher density building within the town boundaries.</p> <p>Regarding the proposal to Apply Design and Development Overlay Schedule 41 and 42 to the majority of the land being rezoned:</p> <p>The Barwon Heads Structure Plan states that Neighbourhood Residential Zone aims to provide for predominantly single and double storey residential development that respects the identified neighbourhood character, heritage, environmental or landscape characteristics.”. However, a stroll along the streets that make up area 5 will quickly reveal that there is no unifying neighbourhood character. Rather, the houses display a diversity of build designs and materials, as indicated by the photos included with this submission.</p> <p>I strongly object to plans to impose regulations that would only allow weatherboard buildings; a material that will require frequent upkeep in a seaside environment to maintain a well-kept appearance. This is far too restrictive on an owners ability to create a design that they would find more practical and aesthetically pleasing, The proposal is also inconsistent with the nature of</p>	

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				existing buildings in this area.	
16	G. Bingley	35 Thomson Drv Barwon Heads	S	Fully supports the Barwon Heads Structure Plan 2017 and also the key policy directions for Barwon Heads.	Support noted
17	K. Blain	Warrenbeen Crt Barwon Heads	O	<p>As a landowner of (Lot 2) Warrenbeen Court, Barwon Heads (part one of the Warrenbeen Estate subdivision PS 412071E &amp; PS 419291B) I strongly oppose the introduction of a 4000 square metre minimum subdivision.</p> <p>The covenant on my land which I purchased in 1999 is set to expire in 2020. With this knowledge it has always been my long term plan to subdivide my land into two tittles. I believe if it was the intention of the town planners to preserve Warrenbeen in its natural state the planning permit to allow for the original residential development and subdivision should never have been approved.</p> <p>Too be fair, our blocks are large enough to cut in half and have one additional home added without significant impact to the environment. If that was not the original intention the council/town planners then why were we given 2 numbers? My family has lived in the street since 2000, the homes that have been built in our street have been sympathetic to the environment and I believe we have all blended into the Moonah environment rather well, without the unnecessary burden and restrictions you are trying to impose on us. Not only are you trying to take away our right to subdivide you are also trying to impose an Environmental Significance Overlay, by doing this you are placing us under further financial burden and tying us in unnecessary red tape, I actually find it quiet offensive, that you propose this after we have spent the last 18 years living in Warrenbeen (our home) and for the caring for the environment around us.</p> <p>Furthermore you the council are trying to do this with no consultation with us the residents/landowners/rate payers that you are personally effecting.</p> <p>I feel the rezoning of part of the original Warrenbeen Estate subdivision and the application of the Environmental Significance Overlay to part of the original Warrenbeen Estate subdivision/s is retrospective, discriminatory and completely unreasonable.</p>	Warrenbeen Crt
18	D. Borenstein	Grosvenor Drive Wandana Heights VIC 3216	S	<p>As a homeowner in Barwon heads, I fully support Amendment C375 as proposed by the City of Greater Geelong and endorsed by the Save Barwon Heads Alliance. I purchased property in Barwon Heads due to its unique small village characteristics and wish to see them maintained.</p> <p>I support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preservation of the current town boundary</li> <li>• The building height limits as proposed in Amendment C375</li> <li>• Compliance with the coastal character design requirements</li> </ul>	Settlement Boundary Support noted

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preservation of the RAMSAR wetlands, for its aesthetic value, protection of the native wildlife and natural environmental function of absorbing large volumes water during flood events.</li> </ul>	
19	C. Bowly	Haynes Court Barwon Heads	S	I strongly support Council's decision at 22nd August meeting to endorse the Draft Barwon Heads Structure Plan 2017. In particular I support the proposal within the plan to maintain the current western Settlement Boundary. The words in the "Recommended Council Position on The settlement Boundary" contained within the minutes of the meeting present a sound counter to the arguments of the developers and I support them as a long-time resident of Barwon Heads.	Settlement Boundary Support noted
20	D. & J. Boyle	Ballater Street Essendon VIC 3040	O	<p>The submitters own a property in Punt Road Barwon Heads and state:</p> <p>Our submission would be that Area 4 be rezoned to be the same as Area 1 &amp; 2 so as to keep building height limits to 9 metres and not increased to 11 metres. These three residential areas of old Barwon Heads should all be the same zoning.</p>	IHDA
21	P. Boyle	Ballater Street Essendon VIC 3040	O	<p>The submitter owns a property in Reid Street Barwon Heads and states:</p> <p>I submit that Area 4 is rezoned to Neighbourhood Residential Zone Schedule and not General Residential Zone. Height limits should be kept 9 metres the same as Area 1 &amp; 2. These areas should all have the same zoning.</p>	IHDA
22	J. Brewster	James Cook Drive Wandana Heights VIC 3216	O	<p>Owner of a property in Henley Street, Barwon Heads.</p> <p>I am concerned that the Barwon Heads residential and landscape character assessment contains what I consider to be contradictory statements and several sweeping assumptions based on overall averages which do not necessarily apply to all areas of Barwon Heads. Furthermore whilst I agree with some of the provisions of the proposed C375 planning amendment there are other provisions which I believe are counter-productive and overly restrictive.</p> <p>My comments are related to Precinct 13 as identified in the residential and landscape character assessment document and section A1 below is a re-statement of items contained in the document to show that I have read and understand the content.</p> <p>Part A of the submission discusses the Residential &amp; Landscape Character Assessment: The document identifies precinct 13 as having :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A very mixed age of buildings and comments that there is a reasonable proportion of new residential development.</li> <li>A higher presence of 2-storey buildings than the balance of Barwon Heads</li> <li>Mixed building materials</li> </ol>	<p>South of Bridge Rd Drafting Village Character</p> <p>The community was extensively engaged in the preparation of the BHSP who provided their local knowledge and opinions. Their views helped inform the Character Assessment which was prepared by design experts Hansen Partnership P/L.</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>d. Mixed lot sizes</p> <p>e. Site coverage for precinct 13 is not identified</p> <p>f. Street trees have been noted as a strong presence in Ramsgate, Campbell and George Streets.</p> <p>g. Large lots, narrower informal roads, a mix of buildings from all eras, including some notable architecturally designed homes.</p> <p>h. Strong influence of the informal nature of the public realm and topography.</p> <p>Comments on the above points:</p> <p>a. Barwon Heads was once a small fishing village inhabited by workers, supporting retail and workers' residences. With the relatively recent change in popularity it has gradually become a desirable destination for retirees, permanent and tourist residences, and has completely lost its fishing village heritage. Land cost/value per square metre is considerably more than most Geelong suburbs. The current character of this precinct and the cost of land will have a great influence on the type of development attracted.</p> <p>b. The higher proportion of 2-storey development will continue if site coverage is limited to 40%. Wealthy retirees, permanent residents, or tourist accommodation development will require maximum habitable space which will only be achieved by 2-storey development.</p> <p>c. Mixed building materials should be encouraged</p> <p>d. Mixed lot sizes exist and will continue to exist. Subdivision is permitted and is controlled by Town Planning, and so should not be a problem in terms of inappropriate development. It should be noted, however that several large houses are located on either 2 or 3 separate title lots and could be either demolished or are located such that the separate already existing title could be re-developed without any subdivision requirement.</p> <p>e. Site coverage in precinct 13 is very mixed, some around 60%, some existing residences between 50 and 60%, many around 40%.</p> <p>f. Street trees in Ramsgate, Campbell and George Streets are of considerable importance in setting neighbourhood characteristics for those particular streets, but such characteristic cannot be applied outside those streets.</p> <p>g. Lot sizes vary considerably in precinct 13 – many below 600m<sup>2</sup> but some larger lots. As pointed out in item d above, whilst current ownership may cover 2 or 3 separate titles, the future may see separation of the titles – inheriting children or developers wishing to maximise returns may result in the sale of separate titles. This with subsequent development may substantially change the character of the precinct despite town planning or design development overlays in place. More “notable architecturally designed homes” should be encouraged to the area.</p> <p>h. The retention of informal nature of the public realm and topography should be encouraged.</p>	

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Input by the Community.</p> <p>Whilst input from the community is a valuable exercise, it should be recognised that they are not design professionals and cannot therefore appreciate all of the alternatives which may exist. The vocal existing community is almost always one which opposes change no matter what the form, the “not in my backyard” syndrome. However few if any would be prepared to give up the improved shopping and other facilities which have only occurred as a result of change and increased land values. I therefore question many of the “fit” and “don’t fit” observations. They are based on personal preferences and not appreciation of good design.</p> <p>Future Change - Key character elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A modest site coverage and retention of side setbacks. I agree with modest site coverage – however would suggest that this be in line with schedules for residential zones which are usually based on 60% coverage.</li> <li>• Side setbacks should be based on orientation. To provide a large setback to the south boundary of north facing block restricts the amount of the block which gives access to northerly aspect. The current requirements regarding setbacks appear to be sufficient.</li> <li>• “.... Presents to the street as single dwellings rather than apartment forms” – is a matter of opinion and design expertise.</li> <li>• Larger front setbacks for double storey home – again should be based on orientation. If the block has the road to the South, then increasing the setback restricts the amount of the block which gives access to northerly aspect. The dominance issue is one for design expertise.</li> <li>• Garages set behind building frontages – this has been introduced to a number of suburbs in Melbourne and is being questioned by many architects/designers. Is a longer driveway more appealing than a well-designed garage and overall front façade ? Surely a matter of good design rather than regulation.</li> <li>• Simple material palates with an emphasis on timber/weatherboard. Totally inappropriate for a marine environment having due regard to environmental considerations and the considerable cost of ongoing maintenance.</li> <li>• Low or no fencing. Agreed, but with increasing need for security, the community might disagree with this approach in future.</li> <li>• Sufficient front setback to provide meaningful landscape .... Most front gardens (if in fact they are gardens and not used for occasional car parking) will be protected by high fencing which is contrary to that stated in vi above.</li> <li>• Accessways to remain unsealed – I agree.</li> </ul> <p>Future Development:</p>	

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I agree with removal of the Residential Growth Zone however the imposition of DDO Schedule 41 appears overly restrictive (refer below).</li> <li>• The assessment document suggests that “the development of single dwellings remains the most dominant development trend” I believe that this is due to the residential subdivisions which have been created in relatively recent time. Now that those are fully occupied the development trend will change. People wishing to live in Barwon Heads will either have to purchase an existing property and renovate/extend it or leave it unchanged or else buy a property for demolition and re-development.</li> <li>• I agree with the assessment document that broader housing trends are towards larger dwellings, so the restriction of site coverage to 40% which is less than other residential zones at 60% seems to make little sense. Surely we want to attract well-planned and designed solutions rather than ones which are arbitrarily controlled by a lesser site coverage. Given the cost of land in the Barwon Heads area, the clientele attracted will probably want what could be called “standard” sized houses. Restricting the site coverage to 40% will force the construction of 2-storey residences to meet these “standard” expectations whereas a 60% coverage might allow single storey construction.</li> </ul> <p>Part B of the submission provides comments on the proposed DDO41.</p>	
23	C. Bridges	Coogee Court Barwon Heads	O	<p>I support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The vision of the Bellarine Peninsula Strategic Plan 2006-2016</li> <li>2. Retaining the town boundary in its present location</li> <li>3. The proposed changes from General Residential Zone to Neighbourhood Residential Zone</li> <li>4. The proposed removal of the Residential Growth Zone but to Neighbourhood Residential Zone NOT to General Residential Zone.</li> <li>5. The proposed change of zone and the proposed Environmental Significance Overlay to the Warrenbeen Court area and fragments of farming land north of Taits Road.</li> </ol> <p>I am very concerned about the rate and type of development which is resulting in a loss of the coastal village character and sense of place that defines Barwon Heads as a small coastal village which is not a growth area.</p> <p>I do not support and object to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed zoning of Area 4 and the Increased Housing Diversity Area(IHDA) which is not appropriate for a small coastal village and is already resulting in developments which are not appropriate to maintain the vision and policies which have been agreed for many years to maintain and enhance the coastal village character. The area of the IHDA is arbitrary, lacks logic and leads to inconsistent outcomes. If it is to be retained at all (which is not supported)</li> </ol>	<p>Settlement Boundary NRZ IHDA Warrenbeen Crt Movement &amp; Parking Vegetation Protection Village Character</p> <p>Regarding ‘3 storey developments in the CZ’, refer to submission no. 13.</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>it should be substantially reduced in area and should exclude any area west of Golf Links Road and the Flinders Heritage area. The proposed DDO41 and 42 are inadequate to protect the amenity and character of the town and the decision guidelines are subjective and vague. The assumptions upon which the IHDA are based, including significant activity centres and transport availability, do not apply to a small coastal village. The policy has failed to provide diversity of housing. Most new developments are large townhouse type units or large houses with little landscaping, vegetation or permeability and do not cater for diversity. Council should be required to advertise or at least notify abutting owners of all development applications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. 3 storey developments in the Commercial Zone.</li> <li>3. The failure to consider and address Movement and parking issues in the Structure Plan. In particular: Council should commit to undertaking a Movement and parking study; Council should address the policy and practice of Council officers having delegated authority to waive statutory parking requirements; Any waiver of statutory parking requirements should require a financial contribution from the developer for community benefit and should restrict any right to resident parking permits where a waiver has been granted if timed parking is introduced; Underground parking should be prohibited due to the risks associated with the high level of underground water; Pedestrian laneways and shared paths should be developed to enhance walking and cycling routes.</li> <li>4. VEGETATION The Structure Plan should include vegetation controls on private land. Council has adopted and a Planning Panel has approved vegetation controls for significant trees on private land in Ocean Grove. Such process should be immediately implemented for Barwon Heads. Developers routinely remove all vegetation including healthy mature trees from a site before construction. The obligation to plant one small canopy tree in the front yard is a totally inadequate response and requirement by Council which has removed any obligation for Soft Landscaping from the approved draft plan for the IHDA area. Such response is contrary to principles in relation to climate change, stormwater and flood management which should be supported.</li> </ol>	
24	M. Bridges	Coogee Court Barwon Heads	O	<p>I thank you for the opportunity to be involved in the process of the development of the review of the Barwon Heads Structure Plan and for the opportunity to provide this submission to the Amendment C375 and hope that you will take time to consider my concerns. I care deeply about the village of Barwon Heads and the legacy we will leave for future generations.</p> <p>We are but a speck in time and are the custodians of this beautiful and fragile village. Together (those who live here and those who have the responsibility to form and implement planning guidelines including Structure Plans and Amendments) have a duty of care to ensure that what</p>	Settlement Boundary NRZ IHDA Warrenbeen Crt Movement & Parking Vegetation Protection Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>occurs here is in the best interest of the generations to come. This is a serious responsibility. Barwon Heads is currently bearing witness to unprecedented development much of which fails to respect the integrity of Barwon Heads as a coastal village of 'unique low scale coastal design character'. Unless urgent attention is brought to this issue our legacy to future generations will be one where those overseeing the development taking place at this time failed to take adequate measures to protect Barwon Heads from inappropriate development.</p> <p>1. I support the retention of the existing Settlement Boundary. Barwon Heads is not a designated growth area and as such any attempt to vary the settlement boundary should be vigorously opposed.</p> <p>2. Municipal Strategic Statement Clause 21.14 OBJECTIVES 'To preserve the individual character, identity and role of each Bellarine township'. What is the individual character of Barwon Heads and where is this outlined? The Amendment fails to identify this and therefore renders the statement useless. STRATEGIES 'Ensure that development responds to the identity of the individual township in which it is located'. What mechanism exists for ensuring that new development responds to the identity of Barwon Heads and where is this identity outlined? The Amendment fails to identify this. BARWON HEADS 'protect the unique character of Barwon Heads as a coastal village located within a sensitive environment and significant landscape setting'. What mechanisms including design principles exist to protect the unique character of Barwon Heads as a coastal village? Where is the unique character identified? and why are there no landscape protections on private land? 'To protect the unique low scale design character of Barwon Heads'. There are no mechanisms currently in place to do this. The Amendment in its current form fails to address these issues.</p> <p>3. I don't believe that any of the points above have been clearly identified in the current Amendment. This would appear to me to be a huge omission and will lead to the continued erosion of the Barwon Heads character (already being witnessed all over the village) by development which fails to show any sensitivity to the unique character of this village. There is nothing to hold developers or those building houses (single or multiple dwellings) to design and construct dwellings which preserve and reflect the Barwon Heads character as it is not clearly defined and there are many who build without thought for the wider environment.</p> <p>4. Barwon Heads is currently experiencing a rapid detrimental change to its character by way</p>	<p>Regarding building sureveyors, refer to submission no. 13.</p> <p>Regarding the DDO25, refer to submission no. 13.</p>

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>of the form and scale of new buildings which are being built, many of which are more suited to suburban areas. These buildings are frequently large, bulky, poorly designed buildings, built boundary to boundary. They are totally unsympathetic to the coastal feel of Barwon Heads and to the surrounding houses and fail to meet the design objective 'to protect the low scale coastal design character of Barwon Heads'. The complete removal of all vegetation on building sites is now the norm and will continue while trees and vegetation remain unprotected. This is totally counter to the stated requirement that 'buildings are located within a vegetated and spacious garden setting that integrates with the vegetation of the public realm'. The fact that this can occur pays little respect to the environment, to the birdlife, wildlife and insects which inhabit these trees and vegetation. Urgent controls need to be imposed to the whole township to see that the coastal character is valued and preserved. This includes greater protection of trees within the whole village of Barwon Heads. With adequate and stringent planning these issues should be avoidable.</p> <p>5. Why is Barwon Heads not worthy of a statement such as the following which refers to Point Lonsdale 'Ensure that new development strengthens the township's coastal character and landscape setting by requiring a high standard of architectural and urban design response....'</p> <p>6. Rezoning to NRZ 6 There is inadequate definition in the requirements in the definition of this proposed zone to protect the integrity of the current low scale form of housing in this area. DDO 41 Design Objectives 'To Protect the unique low scale coastal design character of Barwon Heads' 'To ensure new development complies with specified coastal character siting and design'. As 'coastal character' is not defined in any of the documents which govern planning in Barwon Heads this DDO will have no effect in its current form. There is no mechanism to protect this 'coastal character' When a planning permit is not required to construct one dwelling on a lot there is no mechanism to protect the low scale design character. In fact, a building can be built boundary to boundary in any form (single or double storey) without any adherence to design principles which protect the design objective identified above. This again results in buildings being built boundary to boundary with degradation of street scapes, loss of amenity to neighbours, loss of vegetation and little or no opportunity for landscaping. This is currently taking place. This is grossly inadequate and as a matter of priority all housing plans should be publicly displayed to provide an opportunity for neighbours to object to inappropriate development.</p> <p>When building permits are issued by building surveyors there is no requirement that the Barwon Heads Structure Plan be referred to or considered. While this remains the case</p>	

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>adherence to any 'coastal design' character will be able to be avoided. I understand that somewhere in the vicinity of 95% of building permits are granted by private building surveyors. These people should be required to comply with the intent of CoGG Structure Plans amendments.</p> <p><u>GRZ schedule 1</u> the proposed 400 m extent of this area should be reduced to 100m to protect the character of streets adjoining Hitchcock Avenue. Height levels of 11 metres in these adjoining streets and in Hitchcock Ave is inappropriate. The cumulative effect in Hitchcock Ave will also lead to a complete change in the character of Barwon Head's main street. In its current form this amendment will lead to further degradation of the coastal character of Barwon Heads with inappropriate building height, scale, form, loss of vegetation and loss of amenity. The proliferation of more and more cafes and businesses will lead to the failure of some.</p> <p><u>DDO42</u> These design objectives are not adequate in their current form The same concerns I have expressed under DDO41 apply.</p> <p><u>Buildings and Works</u> 'Buildings are located within a vegetated garden setting that integrates with the vegetation of the public realm'. There is no mechanism to see that this is adhered to. 'Retention of existing trees within the front setback'. As there is no protection of trees on private land in this area this statement is meaningless and un-enforceable. The common practice is the complete bulldozing of all vegetation on blocks prior to commencement of building. This will lead to a streetscape that is predominantly multiple storey buildings with little or no vegetation. This is not the Barwon Heads 'coastal character' which people living here wish to preserve. 'Front building setbacks are designed to ensure that adequate land is available for the retention and establishment of Indigenous vegetation' As mentioned above the current practice is to bulldoze blocks, so, to speak of 'retention of vegetation' is meaningless with the present lack of any formal regulation pertaining to the protection or removal of trees.</p> <p>If DDO's are to be of any use and to have any impact there need to be rigorous mechanisms for ensuring that design character requirements are clearly identified and incorporated into the design process of the development. A mechanism then needs to exist which sees that they are strictly adhered to and permits are not issued unless all requirements have been met. Requirements need to be much tighter. If the CoGG is serious about retaining the 'coastal character' of Barwon Heads this needs to be addressed urgently.</p>	

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>All documents which refer to new building in Barwon Heads need to contain consistent readily identifiable planning and building requirements. There can then be no misunderstanding about what is expected.</p> <p><u>Waiver of Parking</u> The continual practice of waiving of large numbers of parking spaces for new developments in Hitchcock Avenue and Bridge Rd in order to grant permits will lead to further Movement congestion which is already an issue in Barwon Heads. This continued practice is a measure of bad planning. Clearly the village has a finite level of multi storey developments which it can accommodate and sustain and to continue to grant permits for multi dwelling, multi storey developments while waiving parking requirements will lead to a degradation of the area. Also there are a finite number of businesses which can survive in such a small village.</p> <p>Application of an ESO Schedule 6 to the Warrenbeen Crt area..... I support this amendment.</p> <p><u>Vegetation</u> in other areas of Barwon Heads is not valued or protected. This is a feature of poor planning and if the whole process of the Structure plan review is to be of any benefit in protecting the future character of Barwon Heads, environmental issues need to be taken seriously, and rigorous requirements introduced without delay. These need to be applied to the whole village and should have the effect of stopping the current practice of indiscriminate raising of all trees and vegetation on a block.</p> <p><u>DDO25</u> Making consequential changes to clause 43.02 Design and Development Overlay terms such as 'should', 'as appropriate', and 'encourage' are all inadequate and should be tightened to ensure that the intent of the clause is defined and enforceable. They should be replaced by 'must'. Terms such as 'as appropriate' and 'encourage' are not terms which should be used as they have no accountability attached to them.</p> <p><u>Building Form</u> 'Ensure that new buildings are designed to respond to the characteristics of the site and at a scale that reflects the coastal design character of Barwon Heads'. What is the scale that reflects the coastal design character of Barwon Heads? In other sections of the amendment the coastal design character is identified as being 'low scale'. Proposed height restrictions of 11m in area 4 to which DDO25 applies would not appear to be 'low</p>	

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>scale'. If the current recommendation is adopted and this height restriction can extend 400m from the main town centre, this will open the way for a complete change in the coastal character of the village with a consequent change in the vegetated appearance of this older area of Barwon Heads.</p> <p><u>Subdivision</u> There is an ever-increasing trend in Barwon Heads for single houses to be sold with subsequent subdivision and complete bulldozing of all trees and vegetation on blocks. What follows is the style of development which sees multiple dwellings crammed onto the block with boundary to boundary development and again no room for any form of meaningful vegetation. Restrictions must be put in place to limit this.</p> <p><u>Climate Change</u> At a time when global warming is rapidly occurring I am sure that there are many scientifically produced documents which point to the importance of trees and vegetation. CoGG should have access to these recommendations. What is occurring in Barwon Heads under the current planning and building guidelines is, I am sure, opposite to what is being recommended. Recommendations should be considered seriously and incorporated into the planning which is outlined in the current Amendment.</p> <p>Finally, I believe that with resolve and proper identifiable stringent planning guidelines and checks there is a possibility that the essential coastal village character of Barwon Heads can be retained into the future. The current C375 Amendment will need to be tightened for this to occur. In its current form it leaves too many loopholes for inappropriate development to occur. Barwon Heads is currently on the tipping point, where what was valued and what makes this village unique is being lost. I hope that those reading this will have the will and resolve to see that the town character is not irreparably damaged by inappropriate development and removal of trees. The whole Amendment should be simplified with requirements clearly defined and mechanisms for accountability set clearly in place. Permits should not be granted until all of the requirements are complied with. At present there is too much which is open to individual interpretation. This leads to the kind of inappropriate development currently being built in Barwon Heads and the degradation of the character of a number of areas.</p>	
25	S. Broberg	The Promenade Wentworth Point NSW 2127	O	<p>The submitter owns property in Jasper Ave Barwon Heads.</p> <p>Area 4. Proposed Zone (GRZ) Schedule 1.</p> <p>We support Council's housing diversity policy particularly the idea that this area of Barwon Heads is particularly suitable for an aging population due to its proximity to shops, post office, doctor</p>	<p>IHDA</p> <p>Am C375 was exhibited in accordance with the <i>Planning &amp; Environment Act</i>. At such time that</p>

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>and public transport. We plan to build two double story (with articulated levels as recommended by Council) townhouses with lifts to suit this type of resident. We are concerned that the limiting of the building site coverage from 70% to 60% will disallow this construction.</p> <p>The houses surrounding 5 Jasper Ave – 7 Jasper Ave, 3 Jasper Ave and 34A Ozone Road are all 70% of the building site coverage. Our options for building will be curtailed by limiting the coverage to 60% and mean that these surrounding houses will continue to be an imposing presence upon 5 Jasper Ave.</p> <p>5 Jasper Ave is also on the outskirts of this area and so we would request consideration. This area also has building constraints due to the one in one hundred year flooding possibility.</p> <p>We support the Design and Development overlay which encourages buildings which comply with coastal character design requirements for example ensuring that the garage is not a part of the streetscape as in 7 Jasper Ave. Currently our plans include two garages at the rear of the property. We are concerned that our options regarding building in accordance with council's recommendations will be curtailed by limiting the building coverage.</p> <p>We only received this letter informing us of the decrease in building site coverage on Friday 2nd March. We have had no communication from Council regarding these amendments prior to this date.</p> <p>If we had known we would have taken action regarding the property sooner than this. We now request a long extension of time so that we may use the land at our disposal to build the type of building or buildings which we envisage would be suitable.</p>	<p>the Amendment is gazetted into law, any new planning controls will apply regardless of extension of time requests.</p>
26	J. Brookes	Taits Road Barwon Heads	O	<p>1 A careful reading of the planning regulations informing the Barwon Heads Structure Plan reveals that they are <b>too general</b> to achieve their stated aims of enhancing while preserving the 'coastal neighbour character' of the town.</p> <p>1 (a) For instance the Housing Diversity Strategy in Map area 4 was applied by Council in 2008 and was not based on a detailed review of the existing character of individual houses and shopping precinct in Barwon Heads. Housing reviews undertaken since have been descriptive, have soft guidelines and are therefore not potent planning documents.</p> <p>1 (b) The built forms in Barwon Heads are becoming highly individualised leading to an eclectic mix which is then used to justify any design. This becomes problematic for preserving both coastal character and heritage values (which are closely linked) as revealed in the current planning application for 1 Flinders Parade or the current planning application for 64 Hitchcock Avenue.</p> <p>1 (c) Until phrases like 'coastal character' in planning documents such as DDO's become more</p>	<p>IHDA Movement &amp; Parking Warrenbeen Crt Vegetation Protection Village Character</p>

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>prescriptive, the Structure Plan is a weak, circumscribed document which lacks the required agency. For instance, It allows for buildings of 11 metres, almost always with waived parking, and has limited design requirements. This, by its indifference to what actually matters in 'coastal character,' ensures that Barwon Heads becomes an ugly miss-mash of styles often discordant or urbanised and very far from what is generally recognised as 'coastal character.'</p> <p>2 To allow for appropriate development which will preserve and enhance coastal character, the generalised IHDA legislation (clause 22.63) should be lifted across the town, and the Council be given the power to redraft and finesse relevant planning documents to suit their coastal communities.</p> <p>3 There is little emphasis on retaining vegetation, or more importantly, developing a whole-of-town approach to increasing vegetation cover. Concrete footpaths, driveways, roads, and even gardens add to the heat bowls which cities are fast becoming. As an urgent mitigating factor against the effects of prolonged periods of increased temperatures, (climate change) the role of vegetation has been sidelined or given token respect. It appears that some sections of Area 1, e.g. east of Carr Street to the river and Ramsar wetlands, have had their vegetation overlays removed. There is no mention of a vegetation overlay in the DDO 41 attached to Area 1. The residents of Barwon Heads have observed the moon-scaping of whole blocks and the allowing of inappropriate rocks, stones and concrete with low, harsh plants to replace shaded wattles, moonahs and tee-trees. Bird life not valued. Shade not valued. Aesthetic softening of built form not valued.</p> <p>3 (a) Council has been either reluctant or uninterested in planting more of the Hitchcock Ave cedar trees in Bridge Rd, or further down towards Ozone Rd. Since these trees are reaching the beginning of their maturity they are now a valuable asset to the town both in an aesthetic sense, and in offering much needed shade to pedestrians.</p> <p>3 (b) It took a supreme court action to make Council aware of its responsibilities towards the Warrenbeen area Court where past council's had promised the retention of a remnant moonah forest. I would like the Structure Plan to have the retention of vegetation as its core value. This would go a long way to achieving the stated aims of the Structure Plan.</p> <p>4 Future Movement and parking management should not be put to one side, but be a direct focus of this Structure Plan as the development planned around Barwon Heads will ensure it is, even apart from the holiday season, under continual pressure.</p>	
27	R. & K. Brun	Ozone Road Barwon Heads	O	<p>We strongly object to the proposed residential zone changes.</p> <p>As proposed, our residence comes within the Blue Zone and as such it is quite conceivable that neighbouring blocks could be subject to up to 3 storey building redevelopment . We feel that this</p>	<p>IHDA Movement &amp; Parking</p> <p>It is noted that the</p>

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>is unacceptable with regards to the nature and style of the houses along our street as well as the potential unacceptable intrusion into the privacy of our back yards and living areas.</p> <p>The Movement along Ozone road is also of major concern with parking overflow from Hitchcock avenue increasing to the point of illegal parking and significant Movement congestion . This is even more noticeable during the holiday season and weekends. This is becoming increasingly dangerous particularly at the Hitchcock avenue intersection . There was a serious accident there a few months ago.</p> <p>With a proposed increase in housing density along Ozone road this situation will only get worse especially with apartments that do not provide adequate parking spaces for the number of potential residents and visitors. This can already be foreseen happening with the two new developments to be commenced on Hitchcock avenue close to the Ozone road intersection.</p> <p>We note with interest that Zone yellow is not subject to the same building height allowance in the new amendments proposed by council. We believe that our street, indeed all the streets in our neighbourhood should be accorded the same restrictions to maintain its residential character. We believe our neighbourhood should also have the building height restriction of 9.0M to help reduce the concerns expressed above .</p>	<p>submission refers to the 'Blue Zone', which is an error and actually is the 'Purple Area 4'.</p>
28	G. Burgess	Curlew Court Barwon Heads	O	<p>Supports the existing town boundary however does not agree with the 11 metre height limit in Area 4. Nine metres is more appropriate.</p>	IHDA
29	P. Calafiore & M. Stanton	Warrenbeen Crt Barwon Heads	O	<p>We, landowners of Warrenbeen Court Barwon Heads, object to the City of Greater Geelong (COGG) proposed Amendment C375 for Area3 of the Barwon Heads Structure Plan.</p> <p>Whilst we support the rezoning of Area 3 (Warrenbeen Court Estate) from the current General Residential Zone (GRZ) schedule 2 to Neighbourhood Residential Zone (NRZ) schedule 7, we are strongly against the introduction of a minimum subdivision lot size of 4000 square metres.</p> <p>As the original landowners since the stage one subdivision, it was always our intent to subdivide our property to allow us to downsize as we transition into retirement to provide and generate a retirement income by renting out our existing property.</p> <p>We believe the addition of imposing a minimum limit lot size of 4000 square metres is not fair and unrealistic. A suitable compromise could be achieved which would still preserve the native vegetation and allow existing and future landowners in Warrenbeen Court to have the freedom to enjoy their properties, as well as the ability to unlock valuable equity.</p>	Warrenbeen Crt

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>This proposal, if successfully implemented, would be unfair and unjust and would discriminate the majority of Warrenbeen Court landowners from their right to subdivide their properties, as well as significantly devalue their investment by applying a retrospective by-law.</p> <p>The current proposal (Amendment C375 for Area 3) would personally and severely impact our retirement plans and devalue our primary investment as it impacts our ability to subdivide and use our land as we originally intended.</p> <p>If the Barwon Heads structure plan Amendment C375 for Area 3 is implemented as intended, without reaching a compromise; we will initiate legal proceedings against COGG and file for substantial financial compensation for losses as well as backdated Land Rates adjustments back to the estates inception.</p> <p>We trust that COGG Strategic Implementation Unit reconsider the current proposal and come to an amical agreement that is suitable to the majority of the Warrenbeen count estate landowners without the need to pursue unnecessary legal avenues.</p> <p>Furthermore we request from COGG an acknowledgement of receipt of our submission of objection.</p>	
30	F. Calderone	Heron Crescent Barwon Heads	O	<p>The Barwon Heads Structural plan constantly repeats that Barwon Heads will have limited growth. However, It appears from the Plans that about 700 new houses are forecast around the perimeter. This is real growth that is being "glossed over".</p> <p>Also there is no future planning for a through-road (to Ocean Grove). This is the most important omission from the plan.</p>	<p>Settlement Boundary Movement &amp; Parking</p> <p>The BHSP does not forecast 700 new dwellings around the perimeter of the town. Section 7.4.2 contains discussion about developer/landowner proposals outside the Settlement Boundary that the BHSP does not support.</p>
31	CCMA	Dr G. Taylor Floodplain Statutory Mgr PO Box 159 (64	S	<p>The Corangamite Catchment Management Authority notes that the proposed residential zone changes and new controls are designed to reduce maximum building site coverage, create more permeable land and require WSUD measures to reduce impact of flooding in the township with future infill development. The Flood Overlay, Special Building Overlay and the township boundary</p>	Support noted

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
		Dennis St) Colac VIC 3250		remains unchanged. The Corangamite CMA supports the proposed planning scheme amendment C375. The authority will not be making a submission to the panel hearings.	
32	S. M. Champion de Crespigny	Hitchcock Ave Barwon Heads	O	<p>I started coming to Barwon Heads over 50 years ago and built our current home at Hitchcock Avenue in 2006, so I have a strong association and love of this town. I made a submission in regard to the Draft Barwon Heads Structure Plan on 21<sup>st</sup> June, 2017. I would like to make the following comments in regard to Amendment C375 Barwon Heads Structure Plan:</p> <p><u>Town Boundary and Rural Zones</u> It was pleasing to read that one of the key policy directions for the proposed new Structure Plan for Barwon Heads is to “ensure” urban development does not occur outside the defined Settlement boundary and that the existing rural zones outside the Settlement boundary will be “retained”. I support these intentions.</p> <p><u>13<sup>th</sup> Beach Resort</u> It is encouraging that the Structure Plan will “ensure” that the future Stage C of 13<sup>th</sup> Beach Resort is golf course focused and excludes residential development and plans to maintain the non-urban appearance from the Barwon Heads Road. I support these intentions.</p> <p><u>Character and Charm of Barwon Heads</u> Barwon Heads “The Village by the Sea” (as the welcome sign says), is a land locked area which has a unique coastal town character, one which has a small seaside village feel to it, and the proposed changes to the Structure Plan do not fit well with this feel. The proposed changes will affect the residential amenity and liveability of Barwon Heads and the general style of this area and is contrary to the unique feeling the township of Barwon Heads has to offer.</p> <p>The proposed Structure Planning Report seems to lose sight of the <i>main concern</i> of this community that the coastal seaside village character is very important to our community. We do not want this changed by the implementation of this Structure Plan as we want less development that better reflects the coastal character of Barwon Heads. We wish to retain the sense of place and our cultural identity. We wish to protect our vegetation and our environment. We are all concerned at the rate of development with the consequential loss of heritage and character which this brings with it.</p> <p>The interpretation of complex State and Local Government policies is overriding the protections we need for our sensitive coastal environment. We are concerned that the Amendment C375 to the Structure Plan will increase the risk of over development through the rezoning and the</p>	<p>Settlement Boundary IHDA Movement &amp; Parking NRZ Drafting Vegetation Protection Village Character</p> <p>Support for the BHSP position on Stage C of the 13<sup>th</sup> Beach Resort is noted.</p> <p>Previous studies have identified heritage areas in the township. The Greater Geelong Planning Scheme contains heritage precincts and individual listings in the form of Heritage Overlays.</p> <p>Regarding the C1Z, refer to submission no. 13.</p> <p>The GRZ allows a maximum of 3 storeys (not 4) at any point.</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Increased Housing Diversity Area (IHDA) and eventually completely ruin our coastal village culture and make Barwon Heads into a “new suburb” style of development.</p> <p><u>Increased Housing Diversity Area Policy</u>  This policy is supported by the Council and continues to be applied in the proposed Structure Plan. It is an extensive area and has been applied to a large part of Barwon Heads due to a close proximity to the town centre. This application triggers the current Residential Growth Zone and its successor the General Residential Zone. The scale of development and the height of 11 metres in the IHDA Design Development Overlay has the potential to destroy any coastal character our town holds. We are not a growth zone and have none of the infrastructure required to support this scale of development. Barwon Heads does not have an “activity centre”, it is not a commercial mixed use area or a former industrial area and it is not accessed by train to a central hub. Increased housing Diversity does not work here as Barwon Heads is a small coastal town, it is a UNIQUE area with its own fragile environment with flooding and storm water issues. We want this IHDA removed so we can have less intense development that better reflects the coastal character of Barwon Heads. In Area 4, General Residential Zone GRZ Schedule 1, it is proposed to increase the height limit from 10.5 metres to 11 metres, possibly allowing 4 storeys to be built in this zone. This is NOT, in my opinion, the “best fit zone” for Barwon Heads, nor is this to me “traditional”. It is excessive and will have a significant impact on the existing character of Barwon Heads, and have a negative impact on the residential amenity and coastal character we have. We want the IHDA removed.</p> <p><u>DDO41 and DDO42</u>  DDO41 applies to Areas 1, 5 and 6, and DDO42 applies to Area 4 in the proposed Structure Plan and are based on compliance with coastal character design. Without a recognised agreement with Council planners on WHAT IS “coastal character design” any design will be argued to fit this non-existent/vague criteria and hence lead to more unsuitable and unsightly designs being built in our beautiful town. I do not agree that the policy of future infilling housing in Areas 1, 4, 5 and 6 will in any way “complement” the unique coastal character of Barwon Heads by varying the residential zone provisions and imposing a height limit of 9 metres and 11 metres and applying Design Development Overlays.</p> <p><u>Heritage</u>  The heritage values which are so important to our Barwon Heads community and its sense of place and identity are being lost because of the erratic approach to this matter by Council. In New Zealand the local towns pride themselves on their old heritage buildings and use brass plaques on fences which outline the significance of the old bakery, or whatever, with a brief history regarding</p>	

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>it. Not so at Barwon Heads unfortunately!</p> <p><u>General Residential Zone</u> Heights of 11 metres where 4 storeys could possibly be built are proposed for this zone. This is far too excessive and will impact severely on the main part of old Barwon Heads where its present character and charm will be ruined. The design and development overlay DDO42 will provide little protection. How can we be sure this will be strictly enforced?</p> <p><u>Neighbourhood Residential Zone</u> This is the proposed zoning for most of Barwon Heads and allows for a 9 metre or roughly 3 storey building height. The design and development overlay DDO41 will provide some protection of coastal character but is inadequate. Again, how can we be sure this will be strictly enforced by Council?</p> <p><u>Town Centre Commercial 1 Zone</u> The proposed Structure Plan overlay is to adjust this from 2 to 3 storeys in height. We do not want unsightly monoliths being built which ruin the character and charm of our village. We want appropriate low level planning controls not ones which allow for 11 metres and 9 metre high developments – this does not create the coastal village character we wish to retain. We don't want to become another new suburb of Melbourne!</p> <p>We want the Structure Plan to protect our small dwellings. We must prevent the threats to the neighbourhood character of Barwon Heads, the threats of consolidation of individual house lots and the development of these lots to large bulky dwellings which are so inconsistent with the existing pattern and rhythm of our village. We do not want developers to continue to find leeway to develop undesirable houses or multi dwelling complexes which allow for buildings to have great heights. For these reasons the Increased Housing Diversity Area policy is not at all suitable to our township.</p> <p><u>Vegetation</u> The protection of vegetation and the environment is piece meal in the Structure Plan as only Area 3 and Area 6 require planning permits for the removal of native vegetation. There needs to be better protection of vegetation on private land.</p> <p>Soon all our beautiful old Moonah trees will be gone and once gone their charm will be lost forever. Why can't Council see that these are so important and need to be preserved and protected and not removed to make way for development, or just removed by private landowners</p>	

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>willy-nilly. Our native vegetation needs to be protected by Environmental Protection Overlays on private land and throughout the majority of the areas of the Structure Plan. We do support the protection of the Warrenbeen area.</p> <p><u>Movement and Parking</u>  The Structure Plan fails to address future parking and Movement management. Consideration needs to be given to the greater demands put on Barwon Heads because of the Armstrong Creek visitors to our town and beaches; the increased number of visitors to the town using our Air B &amp; B's and sight-seeing; and the increased density of housing in our town.</p> <p>We require Council not to just “monitor” this issue, we require it to give us better planning with better policing of parking with time zones, disabled parking areas and to recognise the needs of the commercial retailers, now, and into the future, with proper long term planning. Council’s approach to continually waiver parking requirements, on average 3 – 4 parking permits for high density use buildings, is not sound policy. Consideration should be given to waivers being paid for by users, rather than just granted to them, or preferably no waivers granted.</p> <p>Our town’s current and future needs should be addressed in this Structure Plan and not simply state vaguely “no major improvements are recommended”, or to “recommend improvements as necessary” is not the action we in this community require. The huge problem during peak holiday periods and now, also most weekends, causes safety problems when walking and driving due to the congestion. The time to act is NOW.</p> <p>“Support” for improved roads, footpaths, cycle paths and stormwater drainage using a Special Rates and Charges Scheme is extreme. Surely the required funds can be found within our current rates source as these are already high enough.</p> <p><u>Advertising</u>  I do not support the total exemption of planning permit applications for single dwellings from advertising and third party appeal rights. It is critical that residents be made aware of the proposed planning permits for all dwellings, be they single or multi-dwelling developments, so they can use their third party appeal rights when appropriate. By removing this right of appeal the community cannot express its views on inappropriate constructions. We need to retain this right to appeal against inappropriate constructions. Council must <i>not</i> remove this right.</p>	
33	T. Clayton	PO Box 1054 Barwon Heads	O	RE: Amending Clause 21.14 Bellarine Peninsula, which includes retention of the existing Settlement Boundary shown on the structure plan map; I am in full support of retaining the existing town boundary with NO exceptions.	Settlement Boundary IHDA Movement & Parking

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>RE: Rezoning all land zoned General Residential Zone 2 and Residential Growth Zone 3 to a new Neighbourhood Residential Zone 6 or 7, or to the General Residential Zone 1; AND Applying Design and Development Overlay Schedule 41 or 42 to a majority of the land being rezoned;</p> <p>Heights of 11 metres or 4 stories (possible within GRZ2) are excessive. There would be significant impact on the character of Barwon Heads. The RGZ and the GRZ's were brought in by Matthew Guy whose competence as a planning Minister has since been questioned and discredited on a number of state planning issues. The local Council then blithely rubber stamped the new zones without the consideration that as a designated no-growth, none service &amp; mostly low key residential village, there is no requirement for his level of density &amp; height. 2 stories should be the maximum building height.</p> <p>RE: 1. Applying an Environmental Significance Overlay Schedule 6 to the Warrenbeen Court area and fragments of farming zoned land north of Taits Road; and Making changes to Design and Development Overlay Schedule 25 (Barwon Heads Town Centre), Significant Landscape Overlay Schedule 9 (Barwon River Environs), HO1649 Flinders Heritage Area, and Clause 22.63 Increased Housing Diversity Areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I support applying an ESOS6 to the Warrenbeen Court area &amp; fragments of farmed zoned land north of Taits Road.</li> <li>2. I do not support the legislated IHDA. It's too extensive and it triggers the current RGZ ergo the GRZ with a large scale of development &amp; 11 metre height limits.</li> </ol> <p>RE: Parking &amp; Movement. This has been ignored in the C375 Amendments document as the CoGG are of the opinion that there is NO Movement/parking problems in Barwon Heads. This is negligent and discussion should commence urgently. I suggest the whole of Barwon Heads from entry to exit be 40kph as a matter of safety for residents.</p> <p>RE: Vegetation. I support better protection of indigenous vegetation on private AND public land.</p>	<p>Vegetation Protection</p> <p>The GRZ limits dwellings and residential buildings to a maximum height of 11 metres and no more than 3 storeys at any point (not 4 storeys).</p>
34	Coastal Planning Pty Ltd	S. Fanning Planning Consultant Taits Rd Barwon Heads	O	<p>The submission is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend Clause 21.14 Bellarine Peninsula to add the key strategies of the Barwon Heads Structure Plan 2017 including an updated Barwon Heads Structure Plan Map.</li> </ol> <p>RESPONSE: Agreed.</p>	<p>Settlement Boundary IHDA Drafting</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>2. Rezone all the land in the Residential Growth Zone Schedule 3 (except land south of Bridge Road) to the General Residential Zone Schedule 1.  RESPONSE: Agreed to rezone it to a lower residential level but to include a smaller area (thus further NCZ areas) and include height limit of 9m (not 11m) in DDO42. DDO42 ought to remove the following provision from the Buildings and Works provisions:  <i>A permit is not required to construct or extend one dwelling on a lot or construct a fence that meets the design requirements in Table 1.</i> There are some risk building surveyors will miss this assessment against these provisions in order to work out whether a permit is require against the Table 1. Public notification is critical in any event so public notification ought to be a mandatory requirement.  GRZ1 ought to be further reduced to a smaller area (not 400m as the blanked provision under IHDA) as Barwon Heads is not reflective of larger metropolitan towns around Geelong that have sufficient infrastructure to host a higher density within 400m. This methodology ought to be further refined and test to approx. 100m radius around the Commercial hub only.  (Review of the following required: The City of Greater Geelong Housing Diversity Strategy, alpha Plan, David Lock Associated)</p> <p>3. Rezone all the land in the General Residential Zone Schedule 2 (except Warrenbeen Court properties) and the land in the Residential Growth Zone Schedule 3 south of Bridge Road, to the Neighbourhood Residential Zone Schedule 6.  RESPONSE: Agreed. However, Schedule 6 to clause 32.09 NRZ must specify a minimum lot size. We recommend no less than 400m<sup>2</sup> as this is meant to be a low-density area. Minimum lot sizes will ensure the coastal character is maintained.</p> <p>4. Rezone all the properties in Warrenbeen Court from the General Residential Zone 2 to NRZ7.  RESPONSE: Agreed.</p> <p>5. Insert a new Schedule 6 Barwon Heads Incremental Change Area to Clause 32.09 Neighbourhood Residential Zone.  Agreed. However, Schedule 6 to clause 32.09 NRZ must specify a minimum lot size. We recommend no less than 400m<sup>2</sup> as this is meant to be a low-density area.</p> <p>6. Insert a new Schedule 7 <i>Warrenbeen Court Residential Area</i>, Barwon Heads to Clause 32.09 Neighbourhood Residential Zone.  RESPONSE: Agreed.</p>	

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>7. Insert a new Schedule 41 to Clause 43.02 Design and Development Overlay that will apply to the majority of the land being rezoned to the Neighbourhood Residential Zone Schedule 6. RESPONSE: Agreed. However, Schedule 6 to clause 32.09 NRZ must specify a minimum lot size. We recommend no less than 400m<sup>2</sup> as this is meant to be a low-density area.</p> <p>8. Insert a new Schedule 42 to Clause 43.02 Design and Development Overlay that will apply to all the land being rezoned to the General Residential Zone Schedule 1. REPOONSE: Subject to the reduction of the IHDA area to be approx. 100m (not 400m) reduced and the DDO42 to include high limit of 9m (to override the zone heights).</p> <p>9. Replace Schedule 6 to Clause 42.01 Environmental Significance Overlay that applies to all the properties in Warrenbeen Court, nine Saratoga Avenue properties, part of Tait's Road and fragments of farming zoned land north of Tait's Road, with a new Schedule 6 on a permanent basis. The Environmental Significance Overlay was applied in the interim by Amendment C374. RESPONSE: Agreed.</p> <p>10. Amend Schedule 9 to Clause 42.03 Significant Landscape Overlay (Barwon River Environs) to ensure consistency with the proposed new Design and Development Overlays. RESPONSE: Agreed</p> <p>11. Amend Schedule 25 to Clause 43.02 Design and Development Overlay (Barwon Heads Town Centre) to provide building form consistency within the Barwon Heads Increased Housing Diversity Area. RESPONSE: Agreed to have 10.5m height limit in town. Movement and parking is incredibly challenging, and some further study ought to be addressed.</p> <p>12. Amend Clause 22.36 Heritage Overlay 1649: Flinders Heritage Area to ensure consistency with the proposed new Design and Development Overlays. RESPONSE: Agreed.</p> <p>13. Replace the Barwon Heads Increased Housing Diversity Area (IHDA) map in Clause 22.63 with a new map to reflect the removal of residential land south of Bridge Road from the increased housing diversity area. RESPONSE: Agreed.</p> <p>Note: there is no tapering down of built form from 10.5m down to 9m from the Commercial are to</p>	

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				the low-density area. There is only the opposite which is contrary to orderly planning principles i.e. 10.5m in the town centre going up to 11m then back down to 9m. This is a deviation from fundamental planning principles associated with strategic planning of built form.	
35	K. Cole	PO Box 1016 Barwon Heads	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a long term resident the Excessive overdevelopment is detrimental to the coastal village amenity</li> <li>objection to waiver of parking in new developments</li> <li>any new development should have off street parking for all residents and commercial use ie apartments restaurants, yoga school gym etc</li> <li>underground parking will interrupt underground water flow and cause flooding</li> <li>Movement is chaotic cars circle the village looking for a park creating safety issues</li> </ul>	Movement & Parking Village Character
36	S. Cole	PO Box 369 Ocean Grove VIC 3226	O	<p>I spend as much time in Barwon Heads and Ocean Grove as I can, visiting my family and my husband's family who both have houses in Ocean Grove and Barwon Heads. The close-knit community and village feel in beautiful/quaint Barwon Heads is seriously under threat with the proposed changes. Very few places offer the qualities that Barwon Heads possesses. I am very concerned about the proposed building heights, car parking, and zone changes, as these will all contribute to the loss of character, and have long lasting/detrimental effects to the town, not to mention the environmental impact.</p> <p>Why does every town need to be stretched to its limits? Why does every town need to be expanded beyond what the long term residents/inhabitants have created? So many locals have lived/supported/nurtured and cherished the town for decades, and the developments/proposals need to respect this. The current Amendment does not. It is incredibly disappointing that there is a need to fight these proposals.</p>	Settlement Boundary IHDA Village Character
37	W. Cox	Midden Terrace Barwon Heads	O	<p>The recent Movement and parking congestion experienced over summer has only exacerbated the urgency in improving trail infrastructure and links throughout Barwon Heads. Putting the pedestrian crossing/ need for a second bridge issues aside, if there was a safe, modern, well planned and linked series of trails and pathways throughout the township this may indeed reduce local Movement and parking. Furthermore these trails will encourage exercise and improve health and wellbeing within the local community and visitors.</p> <p>As a priority Council should fund and construct these trail networks, as per Key Policy direction number 5. Focus should be on providing safe links from the northern end of town (Sheepwash precinct) to the shopping precinct (e.g. along public land adjacent to Carr St river frontage, along the western boundary of the township, and vitally important along the 13th Beach Road which has serious safety issues. Too many families, children are forced to ride along busy roads which increases the likelihood of an accident, potentially catastrophic/ fatal. Council needs to apply a</p>	Movement & Parking


No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
38	G. Crawford	PO Box 1065 Barwon Heads	O	<p>risk management overlay to this issue and act as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>I am <b>not</b> in favour of the proposed amendment C375 - Barwon Heads for the following reasons;</p> <p>Barwon Heads has a significant shortage of available land for new housing, consequently inappropriate developments are occurring because of this land shortage. (3 story houses, 3 story unit block and application for another 3 story unit block, residents selling back yards and large houses being built in those back yards, houses being sold and those blocks being subdivided for a number of units).</p> <p>Council is pursuing a policy of increased densification rapidly changing the character of the town, in many cases car parking exemptions are being approved, parking is at a premium in Barwon Heads without this added pressure. The village atmosphere that is admired by both residents and visitors is being eroded, where making more land available would discourage this from occurring</p> <p>Land is available on the western boundary, where appropriate, environmentally sympathetic housing could be developed and could still maintain the village feel, including parkland areas, walking trails, and other community amenities Any concerns regarding low lying land on the western boundary is not true, and any supposed threats to the wetlands area can easily be managed with the latest rules, regulations and technology available.</p> <p>As a Barwon Heads resident I urge council to consider the benefits that more land availability would bring to the town.</p>	Settlement Boundary
39	J. Crawford	PO Box 1065 Barwon Heads	O	<p>According to the structure plan there is no good reason to change the town boundary. Only a biased/unbalanced report could possibly come to that extraordinary conclusion! Critical shortage of building lots available for an enormous demand of Melbourne sea changers/retirees. Barwon Heads has the highest regional house prices in Victoria and there are only 48 blocks vacant blocks but only 2 for sale, much less than any other town on the peninsula. There is also a shortage of accommodation, lack of housing diversity opportunities. Land is desperately required in Barwon Heads for: Aged Care Accommodation, Child Care, Affordable housing for elderly, Tourist Accommodation, Additional services and Cark Parking.</p> <p>It is not good enough to have in principle, support for these facilities with no realistic chance of being able to provide them. Additional benefit would also be: More housing diversity options, A network of bike/walking trails including Round Heads trail, Make Lake Murtnaghurt more accessible as a valuable attraction, More Parks/BBQ areas around lake area.</p> <p>COGG are in a position to negotiate with potential developers to ensure housing would be of a</p>	Settlement Boundary

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>quality and type to suit the seaside tourist environment (not A/C like suburbia). Attractive generous lot sizes perhaps eco-friendly, plenty of native vegetation and large areas of community land along the natural town boundary of Murtnaghurt Paleo Chanel.</p> <p>At future risk to Barwon Heads is if the rural land west of the town boundary falls into the hand of Stocklands type of company and next time round will become a “David and Goliath”, a multi-national company versus our community. A company who with the financial backing, exercise and political connections to get subdivision through, maximising lot yields and profit goal. There will be no generous offers of free land for the community use as offered by McAfee family in the last structure plan or current landowners may offer in the future.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Council to re-examine the decision and compromise and negotiate a better outcome for the future of Barwon Heads!!</p>	
40	L. Crawford	PO Box 1065 Barwon Heads	O	<p>Today I walked down Hitchcock Ave Barwon Heads to see SBHA members attempting to recruit some of the large Labour Day tourist crowd. Asking for submissions to save Barwon Heads. Their argument to prevent to changing the town boundary, is the wetlands are at risk of destruction if ANY development outside the western boundary occurs. False claims of 2000 homes could be built outside the town boundary. Every Barwon Heads home owner, or resident knows about the structure plan, so why are this same small group SBHA members, still trying to muster support from every person who walks past, when there is supposed to be so much support within the community. The truth is they don't have the support they claim. Many Barwon Heads residents are angry with the BHA and SBHA for claim to represent community opinion on the location of the bridge and the installation pedestrian crossings. Both against VicRoads recommendations, both very unpopular with locals. BHA/SBHA groups now want take Barwon Heads in the high density direction, congestion, parking and Movement problems etc. Inappropriate development in recent years has permanently damaged the character and appeal of Barwon heads. More inappropriate development has been approved (with parking waivers) in the Hitchcock Ave and bridge road area and are expect to start construction soon. In the 2010 structure plan, it was claimed retaining the town boundary would help preserve the village feel. The strategy has failed. I believe that most residents feel change to the town boundary would relieve the pressure on Central Barwon Heads, provide needed land services, parks, and housing demand. Most residents accept change and growth is inevitable and change to the settlement boundary is required.</p>	<p>Settlement Boundary</p> <p>Concerns about various community groups behaviour, resident anger, etc are not relevant to Am C375.</p> <p><i>The Planning &amp; Environment Act</i> requires the Planning Authority (i.e. Council) to consider all submissions.</p>
41	C. Crowe	PO Box 1095 Barwon Heads	O	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I support retention of the western Barwon Heads boundary.</li> <li>2. I support council's intention not to make building and planning controls too onerous. In keeping with the state government's reduction of red tape and its effort to simplify planning processes, there should be no changes to zoning in Barwon Heads.</li> <li>3. I do not support council's proposal to implement a design and development overlay (DDO) in</li> </ol>	<p>Settlement Boundary</p> <p>IHDA</p> <p>Drafting</p> <p>Warrenbeen Crt</p> <p>Village Character</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>the town centre (area highlighted in purple on the diagram). DDOs bring too much uncertainty and subjectivity to planning decisions.</p> <p>4. I do not agree that Barwon Heads coastal character has been appropriately identified or defined in an objective way. What has been identified comes too much from the past and does not reflect the future of design and sustainability.</p> <p>5. In relation to single dwelling applications, I support the proposal not to allow general objection rights and not to require advertising.</p> <p>6. I support an environmental overlay and appropriate control over vegetation clearing in Warrenbeen Court. These changes rectify the mistake made when the original subdivision was approved.</p>	<p>The 'town centre' is the area within the C1Z and MUZ. This area is already applied with a DDO25. The surrounding 'Purple' area is residentially zoned land proposed to be applied with a new DDO42 as part of the Am</p>
42	L. Crowle	Newbay Close Barwon Heads	S	<p>I completely agree with all the proposed amendments in the Amendment C375.</p> <p>It is important that the environment and heritage of Barwon Heads remains protected from massive overdevelopment with multi-storey buildings on small footprints of land, such as the proposed Bridge Road and Flinders Parade. A single dwelling on this land would potentially only have 2-3 occupiers cars, whereas there would be potentially up to 10 cars belonging to occupants coming and going from the same site.</p> <p>Pressure will be applied to pedestrians, car Movement and the potential danger for children as the exit is opposite to the playground. Not to mention the rubbish bins that will need to be lined up and collected each week, which on masse, is unsightly and will further hold up Movement.</p>	Support noted
43	H & S Crowley	Carr Street Barwon Heads	S	Strongly supports the plan.	Support noted
44	M. Dallinger	Seaview Ave Barwon Heads	S	<p>I request that the council vote in favour of retaining the town boundary of Barwon Heads in its place. The wetlands precinct before Barwon Heads is uncommon and a natural beauty to the region that should carry the upmost respect. To suggest it should be the natural boundary does not give the wetlands the protection it and wildlife deserves.</p> <p>Needless to say the village of Barwon Heads could not cope with the doubling of residents. Houses are not abiding by the 60% rule footprints. Large outdoor decks, concrete driveways are putting more pressure and emphasis on stormwater drains instead of the soft drainage advocated in the 2010 Barwon Heads town structure plan.</p> <p>There seems to be no long term planning to maintain its Barwon Heads village appeal which was and still is considered an asset. Instead residents come up against this pressure too often Developers buy, build and sell. The B-doubles associated with developments come through our town and swallow our village.</p>	Settlement Boundary Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				There are many areas close by being rezoned, suburbanised with curb and channelling. Stop here and retain boundary and abide by the 2010 structure plan to protect river and wetland and what character is left in Barwon Heads.	
45	J. de Voil	Henley Street Barwon Heads	S	Supports the amendment however the NRZ south of Bridge Rd should apply to all current planning permit applications. Says there is soon to be a 2 storey subdivision on the neighbouring property at 24 Henry St which will block out northern sun (especially in winter).	South of Bridge Rd
46	Delany Investments Pty Ltd	G. Delany Director 162/1 Albert Rd Melbourne VIC 3004	O	<p>Submission on behalf of the owners of 1 Flinders Parade (Barwon Heads Pty Ltd &amp; Shaloe Pty Ltd).</p> <p>The submission states: <u>Proposed GRZ</u> We do not agree that the amendment to the zone is appropriate considering the subject site is in close proximity to the Barwon Heads town centre, offering good access to services and transport where increased residential development should be encouraged. We consider that the purpose of the Residential Growth Zone is more appropriate to the subject site than those of the General Residential Zone. A key component of the purpose of the proposed General Residential Zone relates to respecting the neighbourhood character of the area, however there is no supporting local policy relating to neighbourhood character which forms part of the proposed Amendment.</p> <p><u>Proposed DDO42</u> DDO42 introduces a number of siting and built form provisions in response to preferred neighbourhood character however, similarly to the application of the proposed General Residential Zone to the subject site, there is no supporting local policy relating to neighbourhood character which forms part of the proposed Amendment to inform the introduction of DDO42. We therefore do not agree with the proposed introduction of DDO42.</p> <p><u>Other concerns</u> Additionally, we suggest that all existing permits and current applications should enjoy the benefit of transitional provisions.</p>	<p>IHDA</p> <p>The submission is not supported. A neighbourhood character policy is not required to support the proposed GRZ or DDO42. The 2017 BHSP will become a reference document in Clause 21.14.</p> <p>The submission does not mention that the site is subject to Permit Application 607/2017 seeking demolition and construction of a 3 storey, 8 dwelling apartment building. The site is currently located within the RGZ3 and HO1668.</p> <p>The permit application is listed for a VCAT hearing for failure to decide (subsequently refused by Council).</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
					Planning permits issued prior to the gazettal of Am C375 will not be affected, however transitional provisions are not proposed for applications under active consideration.
47	Dept of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport & Resources	J Vass Transport Coordination Mgr Barwon SW Region 180 Fyans St. South Geelong	S	<p>This is a coordinated response from Transport for Victoria (TfV) &amp; VicRoads.</p> <p>The submission provides the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan identifies development of a coastal path along Thirteenth Beach Rd connecting to a future 'Round the Heads' trail and improved cycle/ped linkages.</li> <li>The plan should also identify shared path connections to the broader path network including extension of the Thirteenth Beach coastal path to link with the off-road path between Blackgate Rd and Breamlea Rd.</li> <li>TfV &amp; VicRoads are aware of community concerns raised in relation to Movement congestion through the township particularly during the during holiday periods. VicRoads is monitoring the issue however no proposals have been developed at this stage.</li> </ul>	Support noted
48	A. Dickinson	<i>Not provided</i>	S	<p>I would like to express my strong support to save the boundary of Barwon Heads as it is now. The wetlands are critical to preserve and the need to minimise development near them. Barwon Heads is a coastal village and needs to be maintained that way.</p> <p>Barwon Heads Resident.</p>	Settlement Boundary
49	A. Dillon	Hopgood Place Barwon Heads	O	<p>Good to see removal of the IHDA south of bridge road. West boundary good decision. Should remove "development zone for stage C 13th beach resort. They (13th beach) cannot be trusted as proven with their "golf academy" ? Just more housing under the disguise of a golf course.</p>	<p>South of Bridge Rd</p> <p>The BHSP continues to support development of Stage C 13<sup>th</sup> Beach Resort. A requirement is that no residential development should occur on the site.</p>
50	Dominion Property Group	R. Strates 4/90 William St Melbourne VIC	O	<p>Submission on behalf of Barwon Heads Lifestyle Pty Ltd (previously known as Macafee Investments) in relation to their site located at 1900 Barwon Heads Road, Barwon Heads.</p>	Settlement Boundary

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
		3000		 <p>This 10 page submission provides background information relating to the site location, characteristics and planning history. The submission then provides an analysis of the salient issues in the Barwon Heads Structure Plan 2017 which are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1 Purpose of the structure plan</li> <li>1.2 How will this plan be used</li> <li>1.4 The study area</li> <li>2.1 Policy context</li> <li>2.2 Natural and urban environment</li> <li>2.3 Demographics</li> <li>2.4 Township facilities and services</li> <li>2.5 Transport and physical infrastructure</li> <li>2.6 Village centre growth, residential lot supply and further development</li> </ol> <p>The submission requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the Amendment be changed to include the developable part of the land at 1900 Barwon</li> </ul>	

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Heads Road in clause 21.14 within the defined settlement boundary for Barwon Heads;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To include the developable part of the land at 1900 Barwon Heads Road within the land to be rezoned to Neighbourhood Residential- BH Incremental and within the Incremental Change DDO in clause 21.14 -9; and</li> <li>To include the developable part of the land at 1900 Barwon Heads Road in Design and Development Overlay Schedule 41 [DDO 41] and otherwise facilitate the use and development of the developable part of the land at 1900 Barwon Heads Road for residential purposes.</li> </ul>	
51	P. Donald	<i>Not Provided</i>	O	<p>Lack of land for sale in Barwon Heads.</p> <p>130,000 people are moving to Victoria annually meaning 55,000 dwellings are required!! The State Government are keen to attract Melbourne residents away from the inner city, particularly retiree's and elderly to free up land for more compact family style living. There is a huge need for more retirement accommodation for the many baby boomers looking to make a sea change. The proposition put in the structure plan that there is available land supply t Armstrong Creek but Armstrong Creek is affordable suburbia. This does not satisfy the requirements of the large number of people looking for beach location. The structure plan also estimated population growth of 0.34% or less than Newtown. There are also high rental numbers in Barwon Heads, most renters are parents with school aged children!! How will they be able to continue renting or try and purchase houses as restrictions of supply is certain to increase out of their price range.</p> <p>Please look at the big picture and where Barwon Heads in headed so it remains a town where everyone is welcome and our community thriving.</p>	Settlement Boundary
52	G. Donovan	Golf Links Rd Barwon Heads	O	The submission objects to Area 4 building height of 11m saying it should be decreased to 9m.	IHDA
53	D. Dower	Taits Rd Barwon Heads	O	<p>I have lived in Barwon Heads for 7 years and I do not think that the recent developments in Barwon Heads suit the coastal character of the town. The present proposed structure plan does not seem to be strong enough to stop inappropriate development which will for ever change the character of the town. Buildings of 3 stories that take up the whole block and do not allow for any softening via vegetation give an urbanised city feel to a small coastal town.</p> <p>I am concerned that the area where I live which is Area 1 has a DDO 41 schedule which does not protect the environment, especially vegetation in this sensitive area near the Barwon Heads Estuary. The town needs to have an Environmental Significance Overlay Schedule 6 to the whole of the town with details as to how this may be applied in various streets, laneways and business areas. To protect us from increasing hot days we need as much shade as we can get. As long as "coastal character " is not defined we will get a hodgepodge of designs such as the proposals for</p>	IHDA Vegetation Protection Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				64 Hitchcock Avenue and 1 Flinders Parade. The IHDA is not appropriate to Barwon Heads and should not be applied to the town.	
54	E. Edwards	Reid Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>I have lived in Barwon Heads all my life and although I would rather not have so many people living here, accept that progress is a fact of life, but let's try to manage the growth. Area 4 should have a lower max building height to 9.0 m as proposed for the rest of the town. Why not have a consistent height limit. I do not believe 3 story buildings are necessary and they impose themselves on neighbours. The site coverage reduction to 60% is a good idea.</p> <p>All other area planning looks good. I fully support the development of a coastal walking path along 13th Beach Rd.</p>	IHDA
55	EPA Victoria	C. Francis Unit Manager EPA South West	S	The EPA submission has no concerns with the proposed Amendment based on the information provided.	Support noted
56	M. Feehan	Ozone Road Barwon Heads	O	<p>Summary of objection: I object to the proposed Planning Scheme Amendment on the basis that it will allow for exponential and relatively uncontrolled growth of our village, damaging and potentially destroying forever the character that makes Barwon Heads such an appealing place to live and visit.</p> <p>In particular I object to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assigning of General Residential Zone (GRZ) Schedule 1 to Area 4 on the map included in Council's documentation. This area covers a large part of old Barwon Heads and as such contributes significantly to the character of the village. It is essentially no different in character to Area 5 which would receive extra protections under the proposed Amendment. With proposed height limits 2m higher than the rest of the town and more generous (to developers) site coverage, it is virtually guaranteed that the myriads of developers currently circling the town will preferentially target Area 4. Multi story, multi-unit developments that have become the blight of suburban Melbourne will become the norm;</li> <li>The weakness of the provisions of the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 42 proposed for Area 4 especially the potential right to develop without advertising or consultation with neighbours and the imprecise nature of the coastal character design protection provisions;</li> <li>The lack of consideration to the infrastructure of our village which is already straining under the pressure of development within the town's boundaries and from the first wave of visitors from the Armstrong Creek designated growth area. This will be an order of magnitude worse if the growth allowed for in Amendment C375 occurs and when Armstrong Creek reaches its ultimate population target.</li> </ul>	IHDA Drafting Movement & Parking Village Character

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Suggested changes and additions:</p> <p>I respectfully ask Council to consider the following changes and additions to Amendment C375:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rezone Area 4 to Neighbourhood Residential Zone to make it consistent with most of the rest of the village;</li> <li>• Remove the Increased Housing Diversity Area (IHDA) designation for Area 4. The IHDA designation appears to have been adopted in 2008 without a detailed review of the character of the village and the impact of such a designation on that character and it is incongruous with the Bellarine Peninsula Strategic Plan's vision for Barwon Heads as a coastal village;</li> <li>• Strengthen the Design and Development Overlay provisions to require all developers to advertise and consult with their neighbours;</li> <li>• Require all developers to be self-sufficient with parking;</li> <li>• Conduct a Barwon Heads Movement and parking study as a matter of urgency.</li> <li>• Develop a simple, universally understood description of what we all mean by the term coastal village and coastal character for buildings as they apply to Barwon Heads and use that as part of the assessment of development applications. Support that with population (and visitor) modelling and even some artists' impressions of what the Barwon Heads of 2040 might look like.</li> </ul>	
57	K. Firth	Furneaux Close Barwon Heads	O	<p>Having grown up in Barwon Heads it is important to me that the town retains its coastal village character and cultural identity. I love being able to walk and ride around town, enjoy the laneways and the coastal, rural and wetland views. I love the 8km walk around the outskirts of town and would like to see this extended to the "At The Heads" trail. I believe this would encourage a better appreciation and enjoyment of the beautiful and environmentally sensitive place that we live in. I am very concerned about the rate of development and loss of heritage and neighbourhood character. The height and bulk of buildings popping up around town is very worrying. I am concerned that the protections spoken about do not actually work.</p> <p>Barwon Heads is not a designated growth zone and its western boundary should remain firmly in place. A Library with books remaining in Barwon Heads and pedestrian/bike safety is of utmost importance to me. I would like to see more safe crossings, particularly for Golf Links Rd, Geelong Rd and Sheepwash Rd.</p> <p>Our sensitive coastal environs, Murtnaghurt lagoon channel, beaches and rivers need protection from overdevelopment. Barwon Heads is a unique place landlocked by the beautiful Barwon river, coast and the wetlands. I love living here so that I can breathe in nature. It is swimming, cycling, walking, nature and bird watching bliss and I want it to remain that way.</p>	<p>Settlement Boundary IHDA Drafting Warrenbeen Crt Vegetation Protection Village Character</p> <p>Regarding the library, refer to submission no. 60.</p>

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Reading through the hundreds of pages of planning policies has been time consuming and difficult. It seems that State Government can just increase heights etc that seem to apply to urban areas not our coastal town overriding any protections we have in place. I would like to see council put in better protections for our unique environmental and culturally sensitive place.</p> <p>We are already seriously impacted by growth zones 10-15 minutes away at Warralily and Ocean Grove. This is only the beginning of our infrastructure woes as seen with Movement and parking. Parking waivers should not be given. Continuation of the beautiful laneway system through Barwon Heads should be a priority in the Plan, and considered when planning applications are received by Council for developments that provide that opportunity for connections especially to the river and the township.</p> <p>I would like to see Neighbourhood Character Overlays and requirements to advertise. I generally support the proposed amendments to Areas 1,2,3,5 &amp; 6 but still believe they allow for overdevelopment. Area 4 I strongly support the change from Residential Growth Zone, schedule 3 but do not support the change to General Residential Zone, and believe it should be changed to Neighbourhood Residential Zone and the IHDA removed or significantly reduced to 100mtrs or less.</p> <p>I do not support an IHDA classification for Barwon Heads. The principles behind the IHDA area are not compatible with a non-growth zone small coastal village. It is out of scale with the size of the town. There are no opportunities in Barwon Heads for low cost and/or housing for older people. This has been proven over and over again. Why is the Flinders Heritage Area in the IHDA? Experience has already demonstrated that developers fail to provide any significant diversity of housing. The GRZ, schedule 1 does not suit our low-lying coastal town. 11m is too high, 60% too much, no minimum lot size, 1 tree not enough, no advertising, zoning allows food/drink/shop within 100m of Ozone Rd.</p> <p>The scale of development and the height of 11m in the IHDA and the Design Development Overlay is not suited to a large part of to the low lying coastal village of Barwon Heads. The DDO doesn't offer protections just recommendations that are subjective and not specific. Why does the town centre need to be 3 storey. What is the actual maximum height in meters?</p> <p>A Barwon Heads Movement and Parking Study needs to be undertaken. Problems are no longer limited to a 6 week holiday season due to the growth zone and visitor number increases. Previous counts are too old to be relevant today. Underground parking should be prohibited. The high level of groundwater mean that underground parks risk transferring water to neighbouring properties</p>	

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>and contribute to flooding.</p> <p>So many trees and vegetation have been removed from private land. With a structure plan that only 'encourages' retention and enhancement of existing vegetation we will continue to lose significant trees and vegetation permanently. I would like to see a tree study completed urgently for both public and private land in all of Barwon Heads to preserve the landscape and coastal character of the town. I support the proposed controls for the Warrenbeen area.</p> <p>The library is not shown on Map 11, it should not have been removed. Paragraph 2, page 91, 5.1.5 should be deleted as it is not accurate or suitable for this document.</p> <p>A more appropriate comment to make in the Structure Plan would be:  "The Barwon Heads Community Library is a thriving, welcoming place to read, learn, connect and hold community events". The Barwon Heads Community Library should be listed under 5.1 Local Community Services and Facilities, page 88, (limited hours and services) should be deleted.</p>	
58	J. Fisher	Crows Nest Rd Waverton NSW 2060	O	<p>I was born and raised in Barwon Heads. Returning for holidays with family and reconnecting with my hometown is an important part of my adult life. I am making this submission to highlight the problematic aspects of the Am C375 and the Barwon Heads Structure Plan (BHSP).</p> <p>I would suggest that Council needs to provide a more detailed Structure Plan which correctly models the real impacts of their decision to not allow an extension to the existing town boundary.</p> <p>I believe that there is currently a substantial shortage of housing, services and tourist accommodation within the township. These market shortages are acknowledged by Council at various points within the BHSP. We have less inclusive accommodation since the Rondor Caravan Park was converted into residential housing. As tourism is the major economic driver in Barwon Heads, it needs to be able to offer a broader diversity of accommodation options and experiences within a more interconnected natural environment, which will be beneficial for visitors and permanent residents.</p> <p>I believe a town boundary change would improve the quality of life for permanent residents by reducing the level of intensive, inappropriate development within the low lying areas of Barwon Heads and the related stormwater, Movement, parking, services and 'village' atmosphere issues. The future of Barwon Heads growth can be provided for by promoting eco housing and future tourist development that links to the interconnected 'Round the Heads' trail that could be created through the expansion of higher land to the west of the town boundary. All other local, non-growth Bellarine Peninsula coastal townships have had a town boundary change in the last 30 plus years, why not Barwon Heads?</p>	Settlement Boundary

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
59	M. Fisher	PO Box 511 Ocean Grove VIC 3226	O	<p>I have lived most of my life in Barwon Heads. Our children were raised here and return regularly for visits and holidays. Reconnecting with 'home' is an important part of their adult lives. I am making this submission to highlight the flaws of Amendment C375 and the Barwon Heads Structure Plan (BHSP).</p> <p>Council is accepting survey data that represents an unverifiable Qualitative, non-random statistical outcome. This is not a statistically valid means of establishing the views of the whole Barwon Heads community for the purpose of preparing the BHSP and any reference to it should be deleted.</p> <p>As the real impacts of Council's decision to not allow an extension to the existing town boundary has not been made public to the Barwon Heads community, Council needs to provide a more detailed Structure Plan which correctly models it, that is, the degree to which intensive and multi-level developments can be expected to occur, along with all the related consequences of these forms of development.</p> <p>I believe that there is currently a substantial shortage of housing, services and tourist accommodation within the township. These market shortages are acknowledged by Council at various points within the BHSP. Barwon Heads has less inclusive accommodation since the Rondor Caravan Park was converted into residential housing, resulting in the loss of almost a third of the available camping sites.</p> <p>The major economic driver in Barwon Heads is Tourism. Barwon Heads has an important role to play in regards to international tourism, expanding its ability to offer a broader diversity of accommodation options and experiences within a more interconnected natural environment, will be beneficial for visitors and permanent residents.</p> <p>Asian tourism to the Great Ocean Road is booming and Barwon Heads needs to position itself to be able to offer experiences that highlight the beauty and uniqueness of our locality, the original 'start' of the Great Ocean Road. ('Surveying for the road, tentatively titled the South Coast Road, started in 1918 – with the road suggested to travel from Barwon Heads, follow the coast west around Cape Otway, and end near Warrnambool.')</p> <p>The future of Barwon Heads growth can be more appropriately provided for by promoting eco housing and future tourist development that could be linked to an interconnected 'Round the Heads' trail created through the expansion of higher land to the west of the town boundary.</p>	Settlement Boundary

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>This would provide an unrivalled trail meandering through many diverse habitats and observation points. As importantly, it would provide multiple links to all areas of the town from any point of the 'Round the Heads' trail to provide safe access routes to different leisure activities, e.g. fishing, surfing, golf.</p> <p>I believe a town boundary change would also improve the quality of life for permanent residents by reducing the level of intensive, inappropriate development within the low lying areas of Barwon Heads and the related stormwater, Movement, parking, services and 'village' atmosphere issues.</p>	
60	Friends of Barwon Heads Library Inc	c/o K. Firth Furneaux Close Barwon Heads	O	The submission outlines the benefits of the Barwon Heads library and notes the 27 June Council Meeting resolution to continue operation. The submission identifies a number of sections in the BHSP that should be changed to include recognition of the library.	The BHSP will be amended to include appropriate references to the library.
61	J. Gatehouse	Stephens Parade Barwon Heads	O	<p>I own property in Barwon Heads, Stephens Parade. My property is located in a part of Barwon Heads which has strong planning protections which I appreciate. I am concerned at the lack of protections for other parts of Barwon Heads, and the scale of development that appears to be available through the current planning controls and the Structure Plan. I note that Barwon Heads is not a designated growth zone. I reside in Europe and witness how the small towns are protected. I have read the information sent to all property owners and have the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan acknowledges the "unique, sustainable, residential and environmental hub" referred to in the Bellarine Strategic Plan, but does not provide adequate protections to achieve this.</li> <li>• Barwon Heads is mainly flat and many parts of it flood prone, there is poor drainage and stormwater capacity large scale development with little emphasis on vegetation protection and landscaping will exacerbate this.</li> <li>• I get very little comfort that the Plan and the DDO 42 provide a strong enough basis to protect the coastal nature of our town. The Area 4 zone which is the area of greatest concern.</li> <li>• The principles behind the IHDA area are not compatible with a non-growth zone small coastal village.</li> <li>• The 400m radius principle is out of scale with the size of the town, in particular a small coastal town that does not provide key infrastructure services such as other IHDA townships (example Leopold) and puts at risk the coastal area we want to protect .</li> <li>• At the most, a 100m radius around the Commercial 1 Zone C1Z could be included as the GRZ with the IHDA. The 100m GRZ will transition into the C1Z and provide ample opportunity directly around the township centre for infill development. Whilst 100m is an arbitrary</li> </ul>	IHDA Drafting Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>number, it is hard to determine what realistic radius in relation to a small coastal village is warranted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At best it will be removed and the whole of the General Residential Zone rezoned back to Neighbourhood Residential Zone which is far more suited to reflect the purpose behind the BHSP2017 to retain the existing and preferred neighbourhood character.</li> </ul> <p>I grew up visiting Barwon Heads. When I come back I am appalled by the scale of some of the new developments and the lack of any coastal connection. The township character is being lost to boxy developments, housing small shops and town houses/units which are designed for holidays not permanent living. I worry that the coastal nature of the town is being threatened and will be eroded by poor quality development.</p>	
62	S. Gatehouse & A. Lindsay	Barnett Close	O	<p>The broad statement on p 16 of the Barwon Heads 2017 Structure Plan “that Barwon Heads contributes a very small percentage (1.4%) of the population..., it is difficult and unrealistic to retrospectively fund a high level of services at a level provided to more densely populated city areas” <b>should be removed.</b></p> <p>Barwon Heads residents will pay close to \$6m in rates for the 2017-2018 year. We are major contributors to tourism and the economy of the Bellarine. Our community is very involved and active in all aspects of the Geelong Community. We are a major destination throughout the year and are bearing the brunt of the gross overdevelopment that Council has supported to our west and east. We expect to be supported by the Council and that this plan will be the tool that we will use to ensure Barwon Heads remains a special coastal village on the Bellarine.</p> <p>Amendment C375 is a complex set of planning changes, which do not go far enough to ensure that the coastal village character and sense of place in Barwon Heads are protected into the future. Barwon Heads is not a designated growth zone, and the value of its land and the subsequent level of rates virtually ensures it will never be a major contributor to the housing diversity of the Greater City of Geelong.</p> <p>The IDHA classification is therefore misplaced and should be removed. This classification and all the state planning policies that it attracts is a major risk to Barwon Heads coastal identity and its capacity to remain a pretty coastal village that people love to visit and live in. If CoGG is serious about housing diversity and providing affordable housing for the elderly it should identify some of its surplus land and properties, and partner with providers of older persons housing to ensure its goals for the elderly are met. Ironically most of the medium density housing in Barwon Heads is owned by investors and let for holiday lets; and many of the elderly who have traditionally lived in the older style units are selling up and moving on, due to the high level of rates and extraordinary</p>	<p>IHDA Settlement Boundary Drafting Movement &amp; Parking South of Bridge Rd Warrenbeen Crt NRZ Vegetation Protection Village Character</p>

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>prices they are being offered.</p> <p>The protection of the vast amount of development anticipated by the Area 4 General Residential Zone "GRZ" from advertising is not acceptable and should be reconsidered. We have witnessed many developments which have proceeded without any requirement for advertising. Some of these have worked, while many others have failed to meet Rescode standards and have appalled neighbours and the town. We have witnessed the impact of 10.5m high buildings in residential areas; they alter streetscapes, have no coastal link, overlook and over shadow neighbouring properties and the town. Beautiful lush gardens have been moon scaped, and replaced with concrete drives and no obvious landscaping. We acknowledge that the plan attempts to partly remedy some of these issues, however without advertising and notice, it is impossible for locals to know what is happening, and ensure that developments comply and don't ruin their amenity in the process.</p> <p>We have put in a separate submission, with a number of neighbours seeking the re zoning of the west side of Golf Links Rd to Neighbourhood Residential Zone. This random strip makes no sense, and poses a significant risk to abutting properties and our neighbourhood.</p> <p>We are disappointed by the reluctance of the Council to support a formal review of Movement and parking needs. Council should review its parking studies and set proper benchmarks for developers to meet, rather than accepting the random mush that is continually published to support significant developments in town. Why is parking at 11:00am on a Wednesday in June a proper benchmark to judge a 4 shop; 8 residential unit development? How can this study taken in 2016 before any developments were approved in Hitchcock Ave be accepted in 2018?</p> <p>We expect a proper analysis of the cumulative impact of the new developments in Hitchcock Ave on the commercial centre and the town. It appears to us, that on a daily basis there is often limited or no parking. At weekends, there is none. We notice many more day visitors and regularly meet people from Armstrong Creek and Ocean Grove, who park in town to walk, eat and shop. With new businesses and residents surely there will be an increase in people seeking parking; employees and shoppers/customers. If it is not provided, and developers not held accountable for the parking their developments create, our town will be ruined, as will the existing and new businesses.</p> <p>Local planning policies seek to protect the unique character of Barwon Heads as a coastal village within a sensitive environment and significant landscape setting, but the plan fails to do this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IHDA is too big, and the resulting GRZ a significant risk to old Barwon Heads, (the area</li> </ul>	

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>that is the most coastal).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There do not appear to be minimum lot sizes applied to precincts and broken down to High, Medium and low Density.</li> <li>• There are not enough Neighbourhood Character Overlays to protect local streetscape and heritage (except for Flinders Heritage Precinct and now Warrenbeen)</li> <li>• Except for the protections for Warrenbeen, there are no plans to identify significant vegetation on private land, thus enabling wide scale removal of trees on private land.</li> <li>• Parking is not prioritised, and developers very rarely have to provide the car parking that they generate. Council seems pleased to give away parking.</li> <li>• Movement is a nightmare and the Council has not embraced the request to include a formal study.</li> <li>• Council should partner with Vic Roads and develop a proper Movement &amp; parking plan for the next 15 years; it should stop giving away our parking now.</li> <li>• Area on north of Ozone Rd is ad hoc and not logical. Significant impacts on Area 1 properties throughout this zone.</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety should be considered as part of any review of planning applications for Hitchcock Ave.</li> </ul> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>The scale of development and the height of 11m in the IHDA and the Design Development Overlay is not suited to a large part of to the low lying coastal village of Barwon Heads. The DDO does little to protect the town. The proposed requirements for buildings and matters that Council is required to consider in a permit application are subjective and non-specific. Please support removal of the IHDA, and the reclassification of the GRZ to NRZ. If not totally at least in part; by rezoning the GRZ strip along the west side of Golf Links Rd, and the random GRZ zone north of Ozone Rd to NRZ.</p> <p>It is critical that residents in adjoining properties are informed about proposed developments, especially where there is overlap between the zones. There have been a number of examples where Rescode has not been followed, and dwellings have been signed off by Building Surveyors with significant anguish to neighbours and detriment to the town.</p> <p>We request Council to adjust the Plan to include a formal Movement and parking study. We request Council to urgently undertake an assessment of significant trees on private land as well as public land, to inform and support imposing planning controls against the ad hoc removal of significant trees and vegetation from private land and to preserve the landscape and coastal character of the town.</p>	

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
63	S. Gausson	Taits Road Barwon Heads	O	<p>My main concerns regarding the amendment C375 BARWON HEADS STRUCTURE PLAN include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We live in Barwon Heads for its coastal village feel as a safe, pristine environment.</li> <li>The plan does not protect the unique character of Barwon Heads as a coastal village within a sensitive environment and significant landscape setting.</li> <li>Extremely concerned at the overdevelopment that is detrimental to the amenity of the area. We are not a growth area.</li> <li>There are no Neighbourhood Character Overlays to protect local streetscape and heritage.</li> <li>It should include minimum lot sizes applied to precincts.</li> <li>The principles behind the IHDA area are not compatible with a non-growth zone small coastal village. A maximum height of 11m is too high.</li> <li>Parking is not prioritised. Parking waivers of new developments should not be approved. Developers very rarely have to provide the car parking that they generate.</li> <li>Underground parking should be prohibited. The high level of groundwater means that underground car parks risk transferring water to neighbouring properties and contribute to flooding.</li> <li>Pedestrian safety should be considered as part of any review of planning applications for Hitchcock Avenue. Particularly in a town with such a large community of young families and the elderly.</li> <li>Lack of plans to protect vegetation and the environment to preserve the landscape and coastal character of the town.</li> </ul>	IHDA Movement & Parking Vegetation Protection Village Character
64	J. Geddes	Newbay Close Barwon Heads	S	I agree with the height restrictions amendments as its very important to ensure that any development/developers abide by the regulations. We are seeing far too many developments where they get exemptions e.g. Car parking. The proposed development Bridge/Flinders is simply ridiculous. This development will massively affect Movement, parking, rubbish collection and the families that use the playground.	Movement & Parking  The Flinders Ave application is listed for VCAT hearing July 2018
65	Geelong Environment Council Inc	J. Lindros PO Box 771 Belmont VIC 3216	S	<p>The GEC supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention of the existing town boundary</li> <li>Protection of the Ramsar wetland areas and recognition of the need for buffer zones</li> <li>Protection of the coastal township character of Barwon Heads</li> <li>Adequate provision for possible sea level rise</li> </ul>	Settlement Boundary  Support noted
66	Geelong Field Naturalists Club	R. Lowther President PO Box 1047 Geelong VIC 3220	S	<p>The submission notes that the GFNC is one of the oldest environmental and conservation organisations in the Geelong region, originally formed in the 1890s and re-established in 1961 in its present form.</p> <p>The GFNC supports retention of the current settlement boundary which helps meet Australia's</p>	Settlement Boundary  Support noted

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>obligations to ensure the environmental integrity of the nearby international Ramsar site including Murtnaghurt Lagoon.</p> <p>The structure plan identifies that further work is required to identify significant vegetation and biodiversity values of the public spaces within the Barwon Heads area. The GFNC endorse this approach so that appropriate actions to enhance biodiversity outcomes occurs consistent with objectives of the "Protecting Victoria's Environment – Biodiversity 2037".</p>	
67	G. Gemmell	Ozone Road Barwon Heads	O	<p>I have recently completed the redevelopment of my heritage listed property and complied fully with Council permit conditions. The 100 year old boatshed is a key feature of the property which is largely one storey although we have built a store room upstairs in the gable roof. I am surrounded by an eclectic mix of mainly single storey houses which are reflective of the village's coastal character.</p> <p>New planning rules it seems to me will now allow 3 storey developments throughout old Barwon Heads with consequent potential loss of sunlight, overlooking issues and most importantly changes to the coastal character of the village in built form terms and Movement / parking pressures. There is minimal public parking around, just street parking.</p> <p>The Design and Development overlay reads as aspirational yet in conflict with the height issue which will directly impact amenity in the ways described.</p> <p>2 storey height limits should be the maximum if we are to retain character and diversity and avoid the issues seen in many Melbourne suburbs. We already have a new 3 storey building at 42 Reid Street on a very small block with I note high fences all around, a very poor outcome. The new policy proposed will surely just encourage more such over development.</p>	IHDA
68	R. Gibson	Hopgood Place Barwon Heads	O	<p>The parking situation throughout the Barwon Heads "Village" is already impossible. it is constantly exacerbated by the waiving of on-site parking requirements in new and re developments.</p> <p>The opportunity should be taken to REDUCE the height limit to 7.5 as in the Surf Coast Shire. The special village character that people used to love Barwon Heads for is rapidly disappearing. The "coastal character design requirements" seem inadequate to maintain the "village character" that residents and visitors value.</p>	IHDA Movement & Parking Village Character
69	M. Gordon	Thorn Street Barwon Heads	O	Barwon Heads is not a growth area. I do not support 4 storey buildings (IHDA) and the car parking situation is crazy.	IHDA Movement & Parking
70	K. Goudge	PO Box 1008 Barwon Heads	O	I support and agree the urban development should not occur outside the Settlement Boundary for reasons of the sensitive natural environment and the increase of housing and cars will increase noise and congestions to the Barwon Heads 'village' environment.	Settlement Boundary IHDA Movement & Parking

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>I agree with the residential zone provisions of lesser height in developments and the coastal character to be retained in the building/structure of a residence or business, as well as the gardens retaining a coastal character. Sure rezone Warrenbeen Court, this is the only land mass involves the ecological values of the area.</p> <p>Don't agree in the "encouragement" of development of the Town Centre beyond Hitchcock Avenue or east of Bridge road to the bridge. What has already happened in Hitchcock Ave and Bridge Road (east) is enough. The scale of the buildings that are being constructed is crazy and for any new development to approved without parking is ludicrous. With the increase of shops, brings the increase of staff and visitors to the town, to which they all have a car. Where are they expected to park??? The surrounding streets in Area 4 should not have to carry the excessive load during summer or school holidays or weekends throughout the year. Every three bedroom dwelling should have to have two car parking spots on their land/premises.</p> <p>Not in support of funding a "special Rates and charges scheme'. They are services/facilities that should be funded by CoGG for the wellbeing and necessity of a community. Consider bringing less people and cars and development into the 'village' and maybe the additional 'rates and charges' won't be necessary.</p> <p>Movement and parking is crazy during a summer and school holidays. Being self-employed and working from home, trying to get a park during the day to collect post is a no-go zone, even in the evening/dinner time parking is scares. So, during holidays I do have to consider my moves ie collecting post for when I need to go to Ocean Grove as Movement can be horrendous and park not available. Retain all rural zones outside the Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>Ensure the future development of Stage C of the Thirteenth Beach Resort golf course is focused, integrated, delivers environmental benefits, excludes residential development and maintains the non-urban appearance from Barwon Heads Road.</p>	<p>Warrenbeen Crt</p> <p>If the submission is suggesting that the Town Centre (i.e. commercial/mixed use zones on Hitchcock Ave &amp; Bridge Rd) is to be expanded, this is not the case. No additional C1Z or MUZ is proposed.</p> <p>Special Rates &amp; Charges Schemes (SRCS) are applied throughout the municipality to provide for a range of infrastructure. Imposing SRCS would require detailed, rigorous planning, and accord with the provisions of the <i>Local Government Act</i>.</p>
71	R. Griffiths	PO Box 2279 East Ivanhoe	O	Refer to Submission No. 82	Settlement Boundary Drafting IHDA South of Bridge Rd
72	G. Guest	Taits Road	O	We have a beautiful town. Barwon heads is a wonderful place for permanent residents and	IHDA

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
		Barwon Heads		<p>holiday makers alike to live in and visit. It's a precious special place with a coastal vibe on the Bellarine Peninsula. I would like it to remain so.</p> <p>I feel we should be limiting height in Barwon Heads to nine metres and any new building to remain under this height to preserve the coastal character of our town. I would like to support the amendment to C375 for areas 1,2,3, 5, and 6.</p> <p>I would like the following changes to the amendment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. area 4 is changed from Residential Growth zone to neighbourhood residential zone. (I do not support the rezoning of this area to a general residential zone which I feel would open a large part of old Barwon Heads up to three storey buildings which is not in keeping with the character of the town and would change the vibe of this coastal town)</li> <li>2. the commercial zone of Barwon Heads has a height limit of two storeys only or nine metres applied not the proposed 3 storeys.</li> </ol>	<p>Village Character</p> <p>Regarding commercial zone heights, refer to Submission no. 73.</p>
73	L. Guest	Taits Road Barwon Heads	O	<p>I have been a resident of 10 years in Barwon Heads but 20 years on the Bellarine Peninsula. I would like to see the coastal nature of our town Barwon Heads being preserved. This would include the town having most of its native vegetation protected and height limits of two storey on any new buildings.</p> <p>Importantly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I would like to see the proposed amendment to area 4 change from RGZ to a neighbourhood residential zone. This would mean that new dwellings in area 4 remain below 9 metres which is in keeping with the majority of the dwellings in this zone and helps preserve the character of the town. I would hate to see many three storey dwellings and above pop up here. I would also like to see a limit on the minimum size of house blocks here. Higher density housing and 3 storey residential homes will destroy the coastal nature of the town and put added pressure on current town resources .</li> <li>2. I do support the rezoning of areas 1,2,3,5,6, to neighbourhood residential zones.</li> <li>3. I would like to see a minimum lot size</li> <li>4. no underground car parks in Barwon Heads</li> <li>5. I would like the town centre commercial zone to be restricted to two stories (I do not support the change to three stories ) , i.e. 9 metres not 11 meters also to keep in character with the residential dwellings of the town .</li> </ol> <p>I love Barwon Heads . It is a wonderful community to live in and visit. It would be a shame if we allowed indiscriminate development to destroy the character of our town. It should not be marked for growth nor I believe we should be aiming for higher density living. I feel council should</p>	<p>IHDA Drafting Movement &amp; Parking Village Character</p> <p>The 'commercial zone' of Barwon Heads (i.e. C1Z &amp; MUZ) does not have height limits. A DDO25 applies which requires development proposals to generally restrict buildings to a maximum height of 2 storeys. Therefore 2 storeys is not a mandatory maximum height and can be exceeded subject to permit. Am C375 proposes to remove the term 'generally' and restrict buildings to a maximum height of 3</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				also protect the coastal vibe by protecting current native vegetation.	storeys. This is consistent with the surrounding dwelling height limit in the GRZ1.
74	D. & R. Gunn	Thorn Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>I'm writing to express my concerns in relation to the rezoning of the Hitchcock end of Thorn Street to Residential Growth Zone (specifically around our property).</p> <p>I have been part of the Barwon Heads community since 2003 and would encourage the Council to reassess Thorn Street so that those homes that are not adjoining Hitchcock are not rezoned to Residential Growth Zone. I am asking the Council to zone these properties in a similar way to Noble Street - as Neighbourhood Residential Zone.</p> <p>Thorn Street is a quiet family street, similar to Noble. It should be treated the same as Noble and not considered for development. I would ask the Council members making this decision to take time to visit Thorn Street and to consider keeping the properties that do not adjoin Hitchcock to remain as Neighbourhood Residential.</p>	IHDA
75	P. Guy	Hitchcock Ave Barwon Heads	O	The boundary of the General Residential Zone should be changed slightly. There should be some GRZ land south of Bridge Rd especially near the supermarket and suggests a GRZ area between Hitchcock Ave and Ewing Blyth Drive. This area is a central part of Barwon Heads and should be developed to allow medium density living close to facilities. The northern GRZ boundary extends too far north.	South of Bridge Rd
76	J. Hall	Forest Road Double Bay NSW 2028	O	The submitter would like to see tighter controls of height and ratio of buildings to land. Gardens and outdoor space should be encouraged and multiple units discouraged. There should be more provision for 'lifestyle' blocks with room for large gardens, lawns, tennis courts and room for cricket and football etc.	<p>Drafting</p> <p>It is unclear what the submitter means by the term 'lifestyle blocks'. However, Am C375 does not propose any rezoning of land to either the LDRZ or RLZ.</p>
77	R. Hastings	Hitchcock Ave Barwon Heads	O	The submission states that the IHDA concept is flawed and inappropriate for most towns on the Bellarine. Barwon Heads has no public transport options to support an increase in population density. The IHDA must be dramatically reduced in size and height and two zones are suggested: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hitchcock-Ozone-Grove and Bridge roads.</li> <li>Hitchcock-Colite-Margate and Geelong roads.</li> </ol>	IHDA
78	P. & R. Hastings	Hitchcock Ave Barwon Heads	O	The submission identifies four issues which the Barwon Heads Structure Plan must properly address:	IHDA Movement & Parking

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased Housing Diversity Areas</li> <li>2. A Movement and parking masterplan must be conceived</li> <li>3. All developments to be advertised</li> <li>4. Each development must have a landscape assessment plan</li> </ol>	Drafting
79	S. Henderson		O	<p>While I support the revised rezoning of the land to soften development impacts further work needs to be done to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cap building heights around the town centre down to 9m (not 11m) within the new Design and Development Overlay 42.</li> <li>• Ensure the Neighbourhood Residential Zones have 'subdivision' triggers with a minimum lot size of no less than 400m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>• To fully support the rezoning of the GRZ2 down to NRZ2 and that a planning permit is triggered for not just two or more dwellings on a lot but also single dwellings ensuring third party appeal rights. It is utterly unacceptable that a 3 story dwelling can be built without planning approval as is occurring currently in Bridge Road which has forever damage the coastal amenity of the town.</li> <li>• To reduce the INCREASED HOUSING DIVERSITY AREAS down from 400m to no more than approx.100m radius of the commercial centre in town.</li> <li>• To fully support the current township boundary with no expansion.</li> <li>• To support all attempts to protect indigenous flora and fauna in particular the unique Moonah communities in Barwon Heads.</li> </ul>	IHDA NRZ Settlement Boundary Vegetation Protection
80	P. Hocking	Barwon Heads Road Connewarre VIC 3227	O	<p>I note the key policy directions for Barwon Heads as stated in the proposed Amendment C375 and provide comment as follows:</p> <p>Key policy directions for Barwon Heads are: Ensure that urban development does not occur outside the defined settlement boundary as on the BHSP. I totally agree with this policy direction and support the maintenance of rural land and local vegetation with protection of the Barwon River Estuary and the Connewarre Wetlands</p> <p>Ensure that future infill housing complements the unique coastal character of Barwon Heads by varying the resident zone provisions and applying design and development overlay controls. I believe that is Key Policy Direction is not being met. Increasing the building height limits in any section of Barwon Heads and especially in the town centre does not enhance the coastal village appeal and appearance but rather changes it to a modern housing development of suburban appearance. The IHDA is not a suitable policy to apply to Barwon Heads as high density suburban living is for cities and suburbs not for a coastal seaside village. It is counter to the Key Policy Direction.</p>	Settlement Boundary IHDA Drafting Movement & Parking Warrenbeen Crt Village Character  Regarding comments about Special Rates & Charges, refer to Submission no. 70.

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>It is also not appropriate to allow dwellings that cover a complete block and reduce permeable land that is essential for water drainage during heaving rains and at flood risk times.</p> <p>Parking Waivers should not be allowed for any new housing or business buildings as there is a parking problem already and waivers are only increasing the problem. An up-to-date report on parking is required.</p> <p>Underground garages are not appropriate for Barwon Heads given the artesian basic below and the closeness of water to the surface. To do such work would endanger associated and close buildings and structures.</p> <p>Rezone Warrenbeen court properties and apply an environment significance overly to protect and enhance the ecological values for this area Yes. The preservation of local vegetation is essential for maintaining the seaside nature of Barwon Heads and for maintaining the village appeal and appearance and a percentage of natural vegetation out to be required for all properties.</p> <p>Encourage development in the town centre that retains the traditionally scaled buildings and proportioned lot sizes. Again I repeat that this Key Policy Direction has been and continues to be ignored. I repeat all the points under No2.</p> <p>Support the improvements to road, footpath, cycle paths and stormwater drainage infrastructure funded by special rates and charges schemes. I support improvements to items above with community consultation. However, I disagree with special rates and charges schemes. All the items listed are the responsible of local, state and federal agencies not individual community members. We already pay rates and taxes etc.</p> <p>Ensure the continual monitoring and assessment of the Movement and parking network and recommend improvements as necessary. Yes, a comprehensive examination of parking and Movement needs to be done NOW. Movement banks up for around a kilometre at either side of the bridge and this is becoming a regular occurrence, not just peak holiday times. Parking is becoming more of an issue each time the council allows a parking waiver. This practice needs to stop immediately and parking spaces need to be required for all new buildings for residents, visitors and customers.</p> <p>Retrain the exiting rural zones outside the settlement boundary.</p>	

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Yes.</p> <p>Ensure that the future development of Stage C of the 13<sup>th</sup> beach resort is golf course focussed, integrated, delivers environmental benefits, excludes residential development and maintains the non-urban appearance from Barwon Heads Road.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>I note that the BHSP states and I comment below:  <i>“In the year 2016 <b>Barwon Heads</b> will be a unique, sustainable, residential and environmental hub; a landlocked community surrounded by pristine river, coast and wetlands. An intimate community which supports all age groups and provides a place of belonging for residents and visitors alike; where human impact is managed to support the fragile natural surroundings by:  Clearly defined limitations on urban development  Protecting and nurturing natural surroundings by managing human footprint  Supporting walking, cycling, fishing, sailing, surfing, swimming and generally enjoying what our coastal village has to offer in an environmentally sensitive way”.</i></p> <p>This sounds ideal and perfect for Barwon Heads however this vision is not being followed in practice. There are a number of new buildings &amp; proposed developments that certainly do not fit this vision. Eg: the Larkin &amp; Drought building opposite the supermarket, the 3 storey house on the corner of Ozone and Reid street which is boundary to boundary devoid of all native vegetation, and the proposed development at 1 Flinders Parade to name a few.</p> <p>Barwon Heads as a seaside village will die with such developments and become just another urban development.</p> <p>It must be clearly noted that Barwon Heads is not a designated growth area and if we want urban sprawl then there are the places for it such as Warralily, Armstrong Creek, Oakdene. Unfortunately the impact of increased Movement from these adjacent growth areas –is evident with Movement queues up to a kilometre long on either side of the Barwon Heads Bridge.</p>	
81	K. Howie & G. Kelly	Hitchcock Ave Barwon Heads	O	<p><u>Preamble</u></p> <p>While grateful for the retention of the boundary and other aspects of the Barwon Heads Structure Plan as residents of 32 years in the newly minted Area 4, we object in the strongest terms to implementing the Inner Housing Density Area (IHDA) in this iconic and historic area of the town. There needs to be a consistent height level of 9 metres across all the proposed zones so that there is a shared understanding for all the residents and for proposed new developments. Here are the reasons why:</p>	Settlement Boundary IHDA Drafting

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="674 228 1736 448">1. A close reading of the Barwon Heads Residential and Landscape Character Assessment document-March 2017 reveals a community that wants to retain its unique low-key housing coastal housing neighbourhood character and even with the future in mind there is no suggestion that the community wants or needs 11-metre-high density housing developments in the old town grid. Indeed, it is a great mystery how Area 4 came to get such a blanket zone. All the other zones are 9 metres which in itself is much higher than the traditional 7.5 metres that was seen as appropriate for Barwon Heads for many years.</li> <li data-bbox="674 491 1736 743">2. The IDHA is not “the best fit” zone for Area 4 which is the historic heart of Barwon Heads-Village by the Sea. For instance, the Heritage Overlay along the Flinders Parade precinct has a two-storey limit on buildings and certainly not 3 storeys. The IHDA height limit of 11 metres is extremely excessive, inappropriate and will detrimentally impact on the vast majority of the neighbourhood area which has “modest single and double storey buildings,” and strong landscaping. Indeed, there are a number of heritage listed houses in Area 4 as well as a mixture of charming and unique seaside cottages with setbacks, landscaped gardens and trees of mature height in a semi-formal street typology.</li> <li data-bbox="674 786 1736 1070">3. Controversially, a few buildings in Area 4 have been recently built to the three-storey standard but this should not set the precedent for Area 4 in the town. Area 4 has equally valid reasons to be protected as the rest of Barwon Heads has with a 9-metre height restriction. What is a “moderate degree of new residential development for Barwon Heads”? Surely a 9 metre, 2 storey height limit should be applied to the entire town to retain its fundamental character? The IHDA is totally inappropriate for the inner grid of the old town and the application of Design and Development Overlay Schedule 41 to most of the Area is a much better fit. By recognizing what is appropriate development for Area 6 south of Bridge Rd, the Council has identified what is worth saving for the whole of Barwon Heads.</li> <li data-bbox="674 1114 1736 1366">4. A recent VCAT decision in March 2017 in the case of Sharp versus the City of Greater of Greater Geelong VCAT Reference No. P1628/2C over the height and bulk of a proposed development at 2 Challis Street in Area 4 had the judge’s decision that the height of the proposed building at 10.4 metres was excessive. “I find it will have a detrimental impact on the broader heritage place due to its height and subsequent visual impact on what is otherwise a modest seaside heritage place.” Barwon Heads is a modest heritage place, not a growth area like Ocean Grove or Armstrong Creek and as such should be protected by Council.</li> <li data-bbox="674 1409 1736 1428">5. The Design and Development Overlay 42 that is also proposed for Area 4 is manifestly</li> </ol>	

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>inadequate. Although the reduction in coverage from 70% to 60 % is welcomed, the Decision Guidelines do not guarantee that dwellings will not dominate the streetscape or have a dominant built form or sufficient front setbacks or significant landscaping. The problem with these type of design overlays is that some or all of the key points can be waived by well-meaning strategic planners. Or the " Buildings and works" requirements are open to a wide variety of interpretation by town planners and builders and developers.</p> <p><u>Summary</u> There is no need and no justification for an IHDA in Area 4 in Barwon Heads. Any appropriate development can take place under a more nuanced interpretation of Neighbourhood Residential Zone Schedule 6. The land prices in Barwon Heads have meant that buying up old houses, demolishing them and then getting as much money or site coverage as possible from the tallest buildings with the largest footprint, is in realty the name of the game. Against this, the community has the right and the duty to protect our village by the sea from inappropriate overdevelopment as we have done for the last 120 years.</p>	
82	T. Hudson	Knox Drive Barwon Heads	O	<p>I am deeply concerned at the wide range of conflicting planning policies which apply to Barwon Heads village. The State policy for residential development appears to override the protection for Coastal and sensitive environments in other legislation. I would like to reinforce the following:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That we will be seriously impacted by the growth in our area.</li> <li>2. The Bellarine Peninsula in identified as one of the five distinctive area in Victoria that needs to be protected and enhanced.</li> <li>3. Local planning policies seek to protect our unique character as a Coastal Village but the plan fails to do just this.</li> <li>4. The Housing Diversity Strategy, in Map area 4, was applied by Council in 2008 and was not based on a detailed review of the existing character of individual settlements like Barwon Heads. The outcome is that a large part of Barwon Heads was identified as an "Increased Housing Diversity Area" (IHDA). Apparently only for the reason it was within the 400m of a shopping area. This was as a consequence zoned a Residential Growth Zone. This poses a major threat to Barwon Heads as a coastal village and must be challenged.</li> <li>5. The Design and Development Overlay provisions proposed for the IHDA are not at all precise enough to enable the protections that we require. This is underpinned by the fact that there are right entitlements to develop with absolutely no requirements to advertise to neighbours.</li> <li>6. There must be inclusion of minimum lot sizes applied to precincts and dissected into High, Medium and Low Density.</li> <li>7. There are no Neighbourhood Character Overlays to protect local streetscape and heritage.</li> <li>8. With the exception of the Warrenbeen area, there a definitely no plans to identify significant</li> </ol>	<p>IHDA Drafting NRZ Movement &amp; Parking Warrenbeen Crt Vegetation protection Village character</p> <p>Design &amp; Development Overlays (and not Neighbourhood Character Overlays) are proposed to be applied in the town. This will better manage building design and siting on private land consistent with character objectives. Heritage values are already protected by existing Heritage Overlays.</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>vegetation on private land. Without this identification it will allow the wide removal of trees on Private land.</p> <p>9. Parking is a complete mess — Currently the proposed development, in many cases, the provision of multiple car parking has been waived. This is to the detriment of locals who need access to the shops in the main street on a regular, if not daily, basis.</p> <p>I now refer to the Area Maps:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Map Area 4 — IHDA — I strongly support the change from Residential Growth Zone, Schedule 3. But I do not support the change to General Residential Zone. This, I believe, should be changed to Neighbourhood Residential Zone and the IHDA be removed or significantly reduced. I do not support this classification for Barwon Heads. The principles behind the IHDA area are not compatible with a non-growth small coastal village.</li> <li>2. I believe that the following outcomes for development in a GRZ schedule are not desirable for a low-lying coastal town:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. 1 Maximum height of 11m is far too high</li> <li>2 60% site coverage</li> <li>3 No prescribed minimum lot size</li> <li>4 A planning permit is only required when constructing more than one dwelling on a lot, or failing to comply with the very limited design requirements relating to building setbacks, garages, fences or one existing or new tree.</li> <li>5 No advertising required for 11m building, covering 60% of the block.</li> <li>6 The strip on the West side of Golf Links Road has potential for significant impacts on Area 1.</li> <li>7 The area North of Ozone Road is Ad Hoc and not logical. Significant impacts on Area 1 properties throughout this zone.</li> <li>8 This zoning allows; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Food and drink premises without permit within 100m of Ozone Road and Hitchcock Avenue intersection.</li> <li>- Shops without permit within 100m of Ozone Road and Hitchcock Avenue intersection.</li> <li>- Hotel, leisure and recreational, tavern with a permit.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><u>Movement and Parking</u></p> <p>Whilst the BHSP2017 identifies some Movement issues within the township boundary, it does not recognise or recommend any response to the increasing threat to the existing Movement corridor through the town centre. The Movement congestion is recently exacerbated by the influx of tourists over the holiday period. This is compounded by the use of three pedestrian crossings in the main street. I would strongly recommend the introduction of Movement lights (which can be turned off during low seasonal times) and introduced to enable the pedestrians to cross all at once and not in "dribs and drabs" as they are currently doing. The latter being the cause of massive Movement congestion extending the whole length of Hitchcock Avenue as well as across the Isthmus to the Ocean Grove round-about.</p>	<p>The proposed GRZ1 in 'Area 4' does not allow any of the non-residential uses identified in the submission without a permit. The defined use 'Shop' other than 'Convenience shop' is prohibited in the GRZ.</p>
83	D. Hulonce	Knox Drive Barwon Heads	O	<p>Agrees with a numbers of aspects of the Structure Plan including retaining the current settlement boundary and outside rural zones, the design and environmental significance overlays and improvements to roads and footpaths. However the submission disagrees with the extent of Area</p>	IHDA

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				4 (proposed GRZ1) and it should only apply up to Ozone Road.	
84	Irons McDuff	K. Irons Principal Architecture Member and Regional Chair of AIA Victorian Chapter Council, Office of Victorian Architect Design Review Panel and Mornington Shire Council Design Advisory Panel.	O	<p><u>Introduction</u> The City of Greater Geelong (the City) has many changes ahead of it, as the State recognised second city. Challenges associated with its transition from high manufacturing employment into technology, innovation, health and smaller business enterprises requires a clear strategy to meet future employment needs. Other challenges ahead with significant population growth, inclusive of the need to encourage affordable and social housing development and provide for aging population. All of this in a context of escalating land values, and limited resources.</p> <p>Within the realm of planning and place making, the City's responsibility extends to diverse areas, inclusive of city precinct, surrounding rural areas, and highly valued and sensitive cultural landscape and coastal environments. Within such a demanding context, the City is to be commended on the efforts undertaken in the review of the Barwon Heads Structure Plan. The engagement process with local stakeholders and use of urban design specialists to assist in the review of the Barwon Heads Urban Structure Plan has assisted in identifying key issues particular to the township. While Barwon Heads represents a small part of the City, it provides a unique identity and tourist destination within the greater Geelong jurisdiction, creating a positive community and generating income to smaller businesses.</p> <p>With this in mind, I provide the following comments to the proposed changes in the structure plan and C375 amendment.</p> <p><u>Settlement Boundary</u> The proposal to retain the current western boundary is supported, as the City acknowledges that Barwon Heads is not designated coastal growth town, does not have adequate infrastructure to support growth, and is adjacent to sensitive Ramsar wetlands. Additionally the City identified, that any increase of housing to the west would not assist in providing affordable housing, as some may argue.</p> <p><u>Character and Zoning</u> Equally it acknowledges that the qualities of Barwon Heads of significant economic benefit to the city are the coastal and vegetated qualities of the place, and contribute to tourism, identity and economy of the city. Efforts to retain and enhance this quality in the new structure plan and C375 amendment are positive.</p> <p>With the above in mind the following comments are provided to the Draft Barwon Heads Structure Plan, City of Greater Geelong C375 amendment:</p>	<p>Settlement Boundary Drafting IHDA South of Bridge Rd</p> <p>Regarding the recommendation for a design review process at the pre-application stage by design professionals, the City employs urban designers who are regularly involved in this process.</p> <p>Regarding the recommendation for a 'working group' to address the issues raised in the submission, this work was undertaken as part of the BHSP review and update.</p>

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Clause 21.14 amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In principle amendments to Clause 21.14 are supported</li> <li>• In respect to specific clause “Maintain a compact urban form and avoid outward sprawl <u>by ensuring that urban development does not occur outside of the defined settlement boundary</u>” suggest adding, ‘and increased height and density is contained in the immediate Hitchcock Avenue precinct.’</li> </ul> <p>It is unclear why the statement “Consider the impacts of climate change on the future development of Barwon Heads in accordance with the Climate Change Adaptation Strategy to be developed by Council during 2010-2011,” is to be removed. Further strategic work is required by the City with respect to raised floor levels and impact on street activations and a policy with respect to ‘stay or retreat.’ Suggest this be retained in the planning scheme.</p> <p>Design Development Overlays DD041 &amp; DD04</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In principle the aspiration for the overlays is supported.</li> <li>• However: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o It is strongly suggested the DDO42 specifically include the statement “The development will deliver a variety of housing types, with a preference for smaller one and two bedroom housing types” in the objectives. The statement should also be reiterated in the decision guidelines “to support household sizes and aging population”. It is critical the City finds a means to lever this objective to deliver permanent housing and not holiday accommodation if it is to reconcile affordable and diverse housing for the growing population.</li> <li>o Reference to decision guidelines should strengthen wording “consider” to ‘encourage’</li> <li>o Decision guidelines associated with landscape, space between buildings, garages recessed or integrated, natural materials etc is supported.</li> <li>o Terminology “The upper levels of a building are recessed and articulated to reduce the dominant scale of the upper level “ should include ‘to all sides.’</li> <li>o If the decision guidelines are to mandate use of a ‘landscape architect’ in the development of landscape plans, we strongly recommend it mandate use of architects for built form.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Removal of advertising and third party appeal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The removal in some circumstances to require advertising of planning application and third party objection will aid in the planning process, and reduce unnecessary costs. However, it is strongly recommended that this be coupled with a design review process at the pre-application stage, by high calibre design professionals. This will assist planners in decision process and give greater confidence to the community that applications have been adequately tested.</li> </ul>	

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p><u>SPECIFIC ZONE AND OVERLAY CHANGES</u></p> <p>Proposed Change Area 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change from GR22 to NRZ6 retain low scale of 9m which will allow landscape and vegetation to dominate in sensitive coastal area is supported</li> <li>• The inclusion of DDO41 is supported, particularly the reduced site coverage to 40% and increased side setbacks, which will assist in addressing the coastal character, support for vegetation and mitigate flooding issues of the areas.</li> <li>• Area 1 should be extended to include areas north of Ozone Road and west of Grove Road (Removing the proposed GRZ1 to those areas)</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Change Area 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change from GR22 to NRZ6 retain low scale of 9m which will allow landscape and vegetation to dominate in sensitive coastal area is supported</li> <li>• It is suggested these areas, despite any current subdivision conditions or caveats, include application of DDO41, to support reduced site coverage to 40% and increased side setbacks. This will assist in addressing the coastal character, increased vegetation and flooding issues of the areas.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Change Area 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change from GR22 to NRZ7 is supported.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Change Area 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The removal of Residential Growth Zone to a new General Residential Zone 1 with Design Development Overlay 42 and reduced site coverage from 70% to 60% is supported in principle, as commensurate with an area low in public transport, infrastructure, prone to flooding and of unique coastal identity.</li> <li>• The implementation of Design Development Overlay 42 to enable other coastal character aspects inclusive of the 2m side setback, encouragement of indigenous vegetation etc is supported</li> <li>• However, the change from 10.5m high limit to 11.0m is not supported. The additional height is in contradiction to the coastal character identified which should retain built form below the tree line, and is higher than the current limit. It is strongly suggested DDO42 include a lower height limit of 9-10m, and even further should provide an AHD relative level limit to avoid further dominance for built form above trees as a result of topography. (E.g. parts of Grandview Parade are significantly above typical ground level)</li> </ul>	

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent of the new GRZ1 and DD042 area should be reduced to support the coastal character. It is strongly suggested this be reduced to be bound between the northern side of Ozone Road, eastern properties of Grove Road (noting critical flood issues) northern edge of Bridge Road and west side of Grandview Parade (excluding the ridge). The use of simplistic measure of 400m walking to retail in this precinct is a limited tool that does not adequately address the urban design issues associated with the township.</li> <li>The retention of Schedule 9 to Clause 42.03 applicable to Barwon River environs is supported. It is suggested wording in decision guidelines be amended to strongly discourage heights above 7.5m. To date there is no example of a permit that has not dominated the river frontage and exceeded the tree canopy. Vegetation cannot ameliorate this. It should include the properties in the entire block behind, not just those immediately adjacent to the river.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Change Area 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed implementation of NRZ6 in lieu of RGZ3 is supported in principle</li> <li>An overlay applicable such as the Barwon River Environs should be implemented, nominally 7.5m, to reduce height of building above the vegetation especially leading to the coastal dunes adjacent to the Golf Course.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed Change Area 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed implementation of NRZ6 in lieu of GRZ2 is supported</li> <li>The proposed implementation of DDO41 is supported</li> </ul> <p><u>Summary and Further Issues</u></p> <p>The removal of the residential growth zone and preclusion of further western boundary extension is a positive acknowledgement by the City that Barwon Heads offers a unique coastal character, is not nominated for coastal growth, and that strategies argued for affordable housing will not be achievable through these planning tools.</p> <p>The structure plan's recognition of a status quo of increased permanent residents is positive however, there is further work required to understand the impact of holiday lets and rentals on the town's capacity to meet permanent and diverse housing provision. While rates, census and titles may help identify this, it is subject to distortion and further analysis should be undertaken by City to establish the permanent population proportion of the area.</p> <p>The revised GRZ1 with DDO42 proposed, in lieu of existing residential growth zone, does not ameliorate this issue. The proposition for increased housing diversity and the proposed height will likely deliver the status quo of single dwellings of increased height. .In addition ,the extent of this</p>	

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>area proposed is large proportionally to the whole of the township, of equal area to that proposed in Ocean Grove, and fails to address the zoning with urban design principles.</p> <p>Strategic urban design, testing the overlays and zones, applicable flood levels, existing vegetation studies with topography will support the planning scheme and give applicants confidence of potential outcomes with reduced costs associated with lengthy and contentious planning process. The implementation a working group inclusive of design professionals could address this in addition to unlocking opportunities for positive increased diversity with new models of housing . E.g. consolidation parking in lieu of to each dwelling, or reduced car parking in return for increased bicycle, car share and mobility aid scooter provisions, support single level with bedroom and bathroom provision to ground floor.</p> <p>Finally the Implementation of design review process, using recognised design professionals could be used in the planning process. The review could assist in measuring identity, value of place, neighbourhood character and coastal protection. Assessment of planning applications at pre-application stage or early in the application process, in a similar format to that of Mornington Shire Council would provide greater confidence to all parties, and enable the ambitions of the structure plan.</p>	
85	S. Jackson	Ozone Road Barwon Heads	O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No consideration is given for larger housing leading to more cars per household, an example is that a development next to us meant the number of cars for that site increased from 1 to 5.</li> <li>• Waivers given for parking in new developments add to number of cars on the street.</li> <li>• A dramatic increase in Movement in area four, coupled with more cars parked on the street means this area has changed from being easy for my children to get to school to being difficult. Consider reducing speed limit to 40 for the whole of Hitchcock Ave.</li> <li>• The town is losing its village feel with greatest building height being allowed in the area closest to the river.</li> <li>• There is not a real description of what the village character is so developments have nothing to adhere to.</li> </ul>	Movement & parking Village Character
86	L. Jenkins- Wilson	Ozone Road Barwon Heads	O	<p>I am objecting in the strongest manner. The so called " retain the coastal village feel " is being completely ignored. A recent build at 42 Reid street has not complied with the streetscape and surrounding properties. The dwelling occupies most of the block, to almost to every boundary. It overlooks all the other homes, with no regard to existing residents. The increase of multi storey properties is not appropriate for this small town of Barwon Heads.</p> <p>The very limited amount of parking is severely impacting the residents. All the streets are crowded and are getting impassable more and more. More large developments will only add to the already</p>	Movement & parking Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>huge problem. Cars are having to constantly pull over to allow cars approaching from the other direction, and more and more, are then blocking the intersections.</p> <p>Today the Movement was gridlocked from Bridge Road to Geelong Road, and the residents could not exit from their streets. We cannot have more cars with no more parking. This is a very serious problem that needs to be addressed before the damage is irreparable. We came to Barwon Heads to escape from the very development that is now being proposed.</p>	
87	M. Kay	Hogan Drive Barwon Heads	O	<p>The submission supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That urban development does not occur outside the settlement boundary and the existing rural zones</li> <li>• The DDO Schedule 41</li> <li>• The ESO to Warrenbeen Court</li> <li>• Coastal path along 13<sup>th</sup> Beach</li> </ul> <p>The submission states the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NRZ reduced from 9m to 7.5m height limit</li> <li>• Restrict Area 4 GRZ to within blocks of Hitchcock Ave, Geelong Road and Bridge Rd.</li> </ul>	Settlement Boundary IHDA NRZ Drafting Warrenbeen Crt
88	S. Kay	Hogan Drive Barwon Heads	O	<p>The submission supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That urban development does not occur outside the settlement boundary and the existing rural zones</li> <li>• The DDO Schedule 41</li> <li>• The ESO to Warrenbeen Court</li> <li>• Coastal path along 13<sup>th</sup> Beach</li> </ul> <p>The submission states the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restrict Area 4 GRZ to area bounded by Ozone Rd, Grove Rd, Flinders Parade &amp; Bridge Rd.</li> </ul>	Settlement Boundary IHDA Drafting Warrenbeen Crt
89	P. Kremer	Lawrenny Court Barwon Heads	S	The town boundary should remain unchanged. Extending the boundary will only exacerbate issues that impact on the local community; lack of parking, Movement flow, density during peak season, general amenity and environmental impacts. There should be no adjustment to the existing boundary.	Settlement Boundary
90	C. Lewis	Hitchcock Ave Barwon Heads	S	We feel very strongly that the town boundary should stay the same, in order to preserve the wetlands and to maintain the core substance of our small coastal village.	Settlement Boundary
91	B. Linke	Ewing Blyth Dr Barwon Heads	O	I object to the proposed application of the Design Development Overlay Schedule 41, specifically the proposed reduction in the maximum building footprint area to 40%. I request that the 40% restriction be removed or at least replaced with a more incremental change that also considers different limits for varying block sizes.	South of Bridge Rd NRZ  Refer to Submission no.

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>The grounds for my objection include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the almost 50% reduction in permitted maximum building footprint proposed is a substantial change in one stage rather than an incremental change;</li> <li>the change promotes 2 and 3 storey development rather than single storey development in order to maximise living area, particularly for small to medium block sizes. This could have an adverse impact on the town character the proposed planning scheme amendment is seeking to protect;</li> <li>this change has not been highlighted sufficiently to those affected through the consultation process. Various people that I canvassed about this change were not aware of it and said it was not highlighted adequately in the recent explanatory memorandum summarising the changes to the various areas within Barwon Heads (e.g. the description of the change for Area 1 makes no express mention of the 70% to 40% reduction in permitted building footprint);</li> <li>this change and resultant restriction on land use could adversely impact land values in Barwon Heads and such a major change is unlikely to have been within the contemplation of many people who have purchased houses in Barwon Heads with an intention to develop their properties with a building footprint area consistent with the current limit.</li> </ul>	6 for a response about impact on property values.
92	D. Littleton	Geelong Road Barwon Heads	O	<p>The submission supports most aspects of the amendment, including retaining the town's character and the 'round-the-heads' trail.</p> <p>However the submission does not support/recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reduce the IHDA to 200m (currently too large).</li> <li>need to define 'informal landscaping' and protection of street trees.</li> <li>parking is a major problem, not just in the holiday season. Need to find solutions not monitor.</li> <li>Cycle and pedestrian links need to be expanded.</li> <li>Recognise and enhance laneway links.</li> <li>Murtnaghurt Lagoon should be excluded from the State Game Reserve.</li> <li>Underground parking should not be allowed in low-lying areas.</li> <li>No housing or tourist accommodation allowed at Stage C of 13<sup>th</sup> Beach Resort.</li> <li>There needs to be a Movement &amp; parking study.</li> <li>Council property in Clifford Parade should be considered for parking.</li> <li>Provision of facilities needs to relate to rate revenue.</li> </ul>	<p>IHDA Movement &amp; Parking</p> <p>Management of the Murtnaghurt Lagoon is the responsibility of DELWP not Council.</p> <p>Regarding Stage C of 13<sup>th</sup> Beach Resort, there is an incorporated document in the GGPS that states for the land east of Lings Rd (i.e. Stage C): "No development or building to be used as accommodation or commercial purpose".</p>
93	S. Livermore	Hogan Drive Barwon Heads	O	That any amendments to the Barwon Heads structure retain the coastal village character. That heights in a general residential zone and Neighbourhood residential zone do not exceed storeys.	IHDA NRZ

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Heights of 11m or 9 metres in either of these zones excessive in this environment and do not protect the coastal character.</p> <p>Movement and parking is a significant issues in Barwon Heads and waivers to parking exacerbate the issues. Any further developments in any of the zone should hold the developer responsible for providing parking. Waivers of parking in developments in Hitchcock Ave has a big impact on residents seeking to obtain a park to do their shopping in the town.</p> <p>The policy that urban development does not occur outside the defined settlement boundary is supported.</p>	<p>Movement &amp; Parking Settlement Boundary Village Character</p>
94	P. Lockie	Seaview Avenue Barwon Heads	O	<p>Barwon Heads is a very special area, squeezed on an island between wonderful wetlands and the river. It is worthy of the highest scrutiny in regard future development. Whilst future generations might wonder why the Surf Coast and Bellarine peninsula have been so heavily developed, those generations would be aghast if the area of Barwon heads was allowed development that might damage its coastal feel, and more importantly might damage either the river or wetlands. It will do no good looking back in 30-50 years and regretting overdevelopment, inappropriate buildings and clearing of vegetation.</p> <p>1. I support retention of the current boundary, mostly. This is not as will be perceived , a restriction on others living here ("pulling up the drawbridge") but rather maintaining a reasonable buffer zone around the swamp/wetland/lagoon. There seems general agreement that a buffer zone is needed and the current one seems to work well. Until a scientific study can prove that further development nearer the wetland area will NOT cause harm, then the option should be to keep the buffer zone intact. Until it can be proven beyond doubt that further development closer to the wetland and lagoon will not cause harm then the default option should be to maintain the buffer.</p> <p>2. There could be reasonable argument made for very low density development in the farmland north of Taits road, say 5 acre allotments , or 4000m as proposed for Warrenbeen. If this was introduced along with compulsion to replant native vegetation, including some separate forested areas , then it might be a wonderful opportunity to reforest further Moonah areas and other native vegetation. Again a decent buffer zone between any such change and the wetland needs to be maintained.</p> <p>3. The change in building heights in the various zones seems illogical. I would favour Area 1 being allowed 11 m height In area 4 closest to the river, allowing higher limits seems potentially to affect the environs directly around the river and the coastal feel of Barwon heads. I would agree</p>	<p>Settlement Boundary NRZ Vegetation Protection</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>to Area 1 west of Hitchcock being allowed 11 m building heights, but not closer to the river.</p> <p>4. I would favour the Environmental Significance Overlay Schedule 6 being applied to the WHOLE of the Barwon heads area, not just Area 3.</p>	
95	K. Lomas	Ozone Rd Barwon Heads	O	<p>The key policy directions are sound to some extent, however it is already clear that "infill housing (DOES NOT ALWAYS) complement the unique coastal character" of the town.</p> <p>Several single storey weatherboard houses are being demolished in Hitchcock avenue to make way for multi-storey developments. I have objected to 2 of these on the basis of loss of these character homes, and also on the grounds that Movement and parking surveys have been carried out outside of peak Summer periods. Both of these applications have been approved and these cottages are now condemned.</p> <p>Geelong City Council has allowed variations to go through, ie reductions of parking spaces and loading provisions. The town is already being stretched to peak capacity and beyond; nowhere to park in the holidays periods and horrendous Movement queues throughout the summer.</p> <p>2 three storey developments, one in Ozone Rd and one on Bridge Rd opposite the IGA store are NOT in keeping with the character of the town. The amendment that is being proposed under this plan for Barwon Heads in area General Residential 1 Area 4 is to "allow for increases in building heights to 11 metres". This means the likelihood of more of the same. Meanwhile, all other Areas are facing reductions (Area 5) or maintains (Area 1, Area 2, Area 3, Area 6) heights.</p> <p>I approve however of the reduction in site coverage from 70 to 60%. This is an improvement as currently entire blocks are being filled with sub-divisions. However, with an increase in height the same effect will occur; that is, similar numbers of rooms built overall - tall, narrow 3-4 bedroom houses that will obscure light and potentially views to adjacent properties. If one such goes up an No 32 Ozone Road, next to my property (recently purchased by a developer) I will lose West facing sunlight and view. I will be watching this with concern in light of this Amendment proposal.</p> <p>I submit that Area 4 has a reduced building height limit, in-keeping with the rest of the town. Area 4 is a reasonably high density area in terms of the size of the residential blocks in much of this area, and so if buildings go to 11 metres there will be light-shade issues for gardens and potential overlooking issues as is already prevalent.</p> <p>With the recent variations being passed I am concerned about more of what my home has already been subject to; that is overlooking from 2 new homes, Number 21 and number 17 Punt Road</p>	<p>IHDA Village Character</p> <p>Regarding the 'loss of these character homes', unless they are applied with a Heritage Overlay, no planning permit is required to demolish. In the same manner, protecting all original weatherboard houses (that are not applied with a HO) would require new heritage assessments.</p> <p>Preparation of the BHSP did not include any heritage assessments nor does it identify the need for assessments.</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>have clear glass second storey windows looking directly into my property, whereas when I renovated my home I complied with overlooking regulations.</p> <p>It is irrelevant to state that the reason for the height restriction change is in line with the State Govt lifting of building heights to 13.5 throughout Victoria. Barwon Heads is a character coastal town and so this reasoning is contradictory to the stated aim of maintaining coastal character. What happens in the centre of Melbourne CBD or other development areas is not applicable to Barwon Heads.</p> <p>Ozone Road already has congestion issues due to the proximity to the Hitchcock Avenue shops and the new developments at this intersection. There is a market on Saturdays which results in residents being unable to park outside of their own homes. This will be worsened by increases in size of properties and more sub-divisions.</p> <p>For the coastal character of Barwon Heads to be maintained Council should with immediate effect protect all original weatherboard houses and prevent 3 storey developments from taking their place. Area 4 should not be any different in terms of height limits.</p>	
96	S. Lomas	Ozone Rd Barwon Heads	O	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed amendment C375 Barwon Heads Structure Plan in area General Residential 1 Area 4 is to "allow for increases in building heights to 11 metres". This means that we would see houses go to 3 storey's in this area. This is completely out of keeping with the village nature of Barwon Heads and is likely to result in a significant increase in the height of new developments in the area.</p> <p>Somehow a three story residence as already been built in Ozone Road. How this passed the existing planning laws is beyond me and Geelong City Council members should be ashamed that they have allowed such an obvious contravention to the current rules to occur. It is truly an ugly sight. Barwon Heads is becoming too crowded. Parking is becoming harder and harder for local residents, particularly at the weekend. Allowing the building of three storey homes will only exacerbate this issue.</p> <p>I don't understand why you appear to be allowing other areas to maintain the current height restrictions (Area 1, Area 2, Area 3, Area 6) and in the case of Area 5 - see a reduction.</p> <p>I do support the reduction in site coverage from 70 to 60%. This is an improvement as currently entire blocks are being filled with sub-divisions. However, with an increase in height the same effect will occur; that is, similar numbers of rooms built overall - tall, narrow 3 bedroom houses</p>	IHDA Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>that will obscure light and potentially views to adjacent properties.</p> <p>Area 4 should retain its reduced building height limit, in-keeping with the rest of the town. Area 4 is a reasonably high density area in terms of the residential blocks in much of this area, and so if buildings go to 3 storey's (11 metres) there will be issues for light into gardens and potential overlooking.</p> <p>For the character of Barwon Heads to be maintained Geelong Council should not allow any 3 storey developments from being built. Area 4 should not be any different in terms of height limits to the rest of the village.</p>	
97	D. Macdonald	Humble Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>As an owner of Humble Street Barwon Heads, which has been in our family since the 1950's I am concerned that as we very shortly will need to consider a rebuild, not renovation, due to the age of the building, that the apparent restriction to 40 % of the block may well cause us to build higher than we would have preferred.</p> <p>Also this reduction will require more garden etc taking more water!!! Either side of us have each recently built to three storeys, I was certainly not expecting to have to contemplate that, but restriction to 40% of my block may well leave us unable to build in keeping with the area as our family would prefer.</p>	South of Bridge Rd
98	K. P. Macdonald	Clifford Parade Barwon Heads	O	<p>The submission makes the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apart from the Warrenbeen Crt area and the shopping precinct I believe the entire township should come under one standardised zone. I applaud the 9m height restriction and strongly advocate that Area 4 should also become NRZ.</li> <li>• The requirements of Area 5 seem to be a case of shutting the stable door after the horse has bolted, as much of the recent development in this area is outside the proposed guidelines; e.g. materials.</li> <li>• The application of DDO41 is ridiculous and absurd in regards to planting of locally indigenous species and 40% building site coverage. Retirees and young families may not be capable of maintaining a garden, and water becoming a finite resource, decreasing garden sizes rather than enlarging them is a no-brainer.</li> </ul>	NRZ IHDA
99	W. Manderson	PO Box 4264 Richmond VIC 3121	O	Warrenbeen Court landowner who recommends changes to Schedule 6 to the Environmental Significance Overlay.	Drafting
100	G. Mann	Taits Road Barwon Heads	O	<p>The submission states:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the 11m height limit to Area 4</li> <li>2. Please define what is unique coastal character</li> </ol>	IHDA Drafting Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>3. There is no provision for more car parking in Area 4</p> <p>4. Please define the building site coverage in Area 1</p> <p>5. What logic is there to the northern boundaries of Area 4</p> <p>6. There is no proper protection of vegetation throughout the town.</p>	Vegetation Protection
101	D. McCann	Flinders Parade Barwon Heads	O	<p>I generally support the thrust of the current Amendment, but am concerned that the town centre and area 4 statutory parking requirements will continue to be waived and that current and future Movement flow and pedestrian safety requirements in these areas, is not adequately addressed in the proposed amendment.</p> <p>I also submit that the structure plan be regularly reviewed to allow for planned orderly growth with the implementation of future ancillary service requirements for an increased permanent resident population.</p>	Movement & Parking
102	H. McCarthy	Hitchcock Ave Barwon Heads	O	<p>The submission states that Council is too easily seduced and compromised by the treasures of tourism and booming real estate. The submission raises a number of concerns summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fears that the low-rise village will be lost.</li> <li>• No guidelines for the shopping precinct. What are Council's benchmarks?</li> <li>• Underground car parking and the water table.</li> <li>• New developments should provide statutory car parking requirements.</li> <li>• Movement management issues, including heavy vehicles and emergency vehicles.</li> <li>• Guidelines and benchmarks for vegetation need to be developed.</li> <li>• Council planners ignore the guidelines they have developed.</li> <li>• Do not sell or soil or prostitute our environment.</li> </ul>	<p>Movement &amp; Parking Village Character</p> <p>The shopping precinct is zoned C1Z and MUZ. This area is applied with a DDO25 to guide new building setting, siting, form, details and finishes.</p>
103	H. McCarthy	Taits Road Barwon Heads	O	<p>This is a separate submission from H. McCarthy that supports Council's 'attempts' to address the complex planning and development issues that affect Barwon Heads. The submission then raises a number of concerns summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed amendments are cosmetic only.</li> <li>• Significant destruction of the coastal atmosphere, river environment and large tracts of native vegetation.</li> <li>• Reference to VCAT decision to refuse permit application 1025/2014.</li> <li>• Council's Residential Character Guidelines (2001) have not been replaced.</li> <li>• Permits granted for two excessively large housing developments close to the river estuary.</li> <li>• There is insufficient environmental guidelines for new developments.</li> <li>• Council should be stronger in dealing with over-arching State Govt policy.</li> <li>• Respect neighbourhood character, community health &amp; wellbeing, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>Vegetation Protection Village Character</p> <p>Council's Residential Character Guidelines (2001) were a reference document only and removed as part of Am C300 <i>New Residential Zones</i>. The brochures were outdated and too generic.</p>
104	P.	Dudley Court	O	In general, I am supportive of the key policy directions for Barwon Heads. In particular, I strongly	Settlement Boundary

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
	McCoughtry	Barwon Heads		<p>support the policy that urban development does not occur outside the defined settlement boundary.</p> <p>Areas of concern:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General Residential Zone (Area 4) - I do not support the change from RGZ to General Residential Zone (GRZ) due to the increase in building height allowance. There are a number of buildings in Barwon Heads that have been constructed (under construction) recently that are 3 or more stories which are already creating a negative visual impact on the coastal setting and character of the town.</li> <li>2. The Design and Development Overlay 41 needs to clearly define character attributes that are complimentary to the town and coastal environment. I refer you to the Victorian Coastal Council <i>Siting and Design Guidelines</i>, while focussing on Crown land, this refers to design guides for coastal towns, particularly areas adjoining or with visual impact on the coast.</li> <li>3. I do not support removal of advertising (planning permit) for single dwellings and third party appeal rights. I have the right to be informed of what may be constructed or built adjacent or near me and consider a new developments impact on my property or the local environment/surrounds.</li> <li>4. Strengthen vegetation management and protection, particularly on private land where it is clearly evident that damage and removal of native vegetation on private property in the rural zone is occurring. Fire protection is not a suitable excuse when these private property owners already have open expanses of grassland for stock. Moonah woodlands on these private rural properties are being trampled by cattle and horses with no management (fencing).</li> </ol>	IHDA Drafting Vegetation Protection
105	A Merewether	Monahan Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>I am concerned about the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The amendments do not go far enough to protect the village character of Barwon Heads</li> <li>2. 11 metre height i.e. 3 storey buildings are too tall for a coastal village</li> <li>3. Insufficient protection has been given to retaining existing vegetation.</li> </ol>	IHDA Vegetation Protection Village Character
106	J. Mitchell	Ozone Rd Barwon Heads	O	<p>Area 4 - I object to the proposal to increase the height limit of buildings to 11 metres. This height increase is not in keeping with the coastal neighbourhood character and causes significant concern to myself and others who live in single storey dwellings - buildings of 11 metres dwarf other houses and cause overshadowing and loss of amenity and enjoyment.</p> <p>Other issues that I can foresee resulting from the proposed amendments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• issues with parking in Hitchcock Avenue and surrounding streets (this is already a huge issue over summer and each weekend)</li> <li>• increased pressure on local infrastructure and natural resources</li> </ul>	IHDA Movement & Parking Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• loss of local character, we moved to Barwon Heads for its local charm and this is already being lost with new developments and old houses being torn down and the Main Street resembling a city shopping strip</li> <li>• neighbours are not currently advised of changes or development of single applicant housing development (i.e. 'the house next door to you is being demolished and replaced with a 3 storey building') - I believe this should be changed to allow residents a chance to view and, where necessary, object.</li> </ul> <p>On a positive note I agree with the proposal to retain the town boundary and the proposed Round the Heads trail.</p>	
107	Morgan & Griffin	Con Alevras Project Manager L16 90 Collins St Melbourne VIC 3000	S	<p>Submission regarding the land at Oakdene West and Oakdene Estate, Ocean Grove as follows:</p> <p>We are the owners and developers of the abovementioned land in Ocean Grove. We support the proposed structure plan and settlement boundary as exhibited. In this regard please find our submission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Amendment is consistent with the Municipal Strategic Statement (MSS). We highlight that amongst other matters Clause 21.14-2 of the MSS states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure land use and development proceeds generally in accordance with the relevant Structure Plan maps included in this Clause.</li> <li>• Direct the bulk of residential growth and retail development to Ocean Grove, Drysdale/Clifton Springs and Leopold consistent with the relevant Structure Plan maps included in this clause.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Any changes to the settlement boundary are premature and conflict with strategies for the recently completed Amendment C346 Ocean Grove Structure Plan. The MSS strategies for Ocean Grove require the completion of a major body of work being the settlement boundary review. Review the Structure Plan including an assessment of long term growth options (both infill and settlement expansion) for Ocean Grove by no later than 2021. The assessment should include consideration of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• land to the north, north-west and east of Ocean Grove.</li> <li>• the role of Ocean Grove as a district town.</li> <li>• other planned growth on the Bellarine Peninsula.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>We note that a framework to tackle the challenges of growth on the Bellarine Peninsula was detailed within recommendations of the Planning Panel's report to the Ocean Grove Structure Plan 2015. Accordingly, we submit it is important for Council to progress the Ocean Grove settlement boundary review.</p>	<p>Settlement Boundary</p> <p>Reference to Ocean Grove and any review of its settlement boundary is noted, however outside the scope of Am C375 and does not require a response.</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				We look forward to Council's acknowledgment of receipt and consideration of this submission to Amendment C375. We also look forward to being involved in any further community consultation.	
108	N. Nagle	Henley Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>I wish to support the amendment C375 Barwon Heads Structure Plan and would like to make these additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change the zoning for the township to reduce all building heights to two levels only</li> <li>• Cease waiving car parking for commercial activity in the main business area and adjacent to the river (for existing and potential new developments)</li> <li>• Take a longer term view with Vic Roads in planning for and responding to Movement management/congestion/people safety at least on the main entry/exit points to Barwon Heads</li> </ul>	IHDA Movement & Parking
109	T. Nagle	Henley Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>To whom it may concern, I wish to support the amendment C375 Barwon Heads Structure Plan and would like to make three additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of car parking (around the main business area) and Movement management needs to be implemented as a matter of urgency (to take into due consideration the impact of residential growth in the region and in particular the surrounding townships marked for significant population expansion)</li> <li>• Identify and implement strategies that preserve the coastal environment, western town boundary as well as Lake Murtnaghurt in collaboration with the relevant authorities to uphold the pristine and unique environment (that does not include around the heads trail)</li> <li>• Consider amending the height of residential buildings to only allow for two levels within the township of Barwon Heads.</li> </ul>	IHDA Settlement Boundary Movement & Parking
110	C. Neale	Sheepwash Rd Barwon Heads	O	<p>I fully support the retention of the town boundary and the Save Barwon Heads Alliance stance in relation to Amendment C375.</p> <p>Barwon Heads is under unsustainable pressure to become over developed and lose the coastal village feel forever. The impact of over development is already been felt environmentally with continued loss of mature trees and vegetation being removed to enable higher density housing.</p> <p>This loss of native environment is affecting bird and wildlife; imagine the impact if the town boundaries were increased; what impact there would be on the significant wetlands and wildlife. Our town is being loved to death; to the endangered hood plover &amp; the fragile mangroves and the marine sanctuary-the rock pools.</p> <p>All being signs that the area cannot cope with the pressure of increased housing both from within and from any attempt to increase the town boundary to enable more development and more housing. The town has had to venture into our natural environment with Council building in the</p>	Settlement Boundary IHDA Movement & Parking Village Character

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>54 acres to provide for child care services to cope with the already increased demand. The school also has lost the opportunity for long term plans it had for a natural environment development at the rear of the school oval to cater for new buildings and portables to cope with the pressure of all the extra students; all while Council seeking to close the library.</p> <p>Our town is being irrevocably changed with great profit to developers but little gain to the town and the environment. The character of Barwon Heads low-rise smaller foot print dwellings give a relaxed village feel along with informal streetscapes and trees and vegetation; not high-rise high density causing damage to our environment at any cost with a significant loss to our environment and the culture of the town</p> <p>Site coverage of 40% should be applied to all areas of the town aside from the main commercial area. Please retain the boundary of the town as it currently exists. Please protect the coastal village feel that is unique to our town and preserve it for everyone to enjoy-visitors and residents.</p>	
111	Novo Planning	K. Kilpatrick Director PO Box 8151 Newtown VIC 3220	O	<p>This submission is made on behalf of a BH resident and landowner: C. Hill. Mr Hill is interested in the proposed NRZ6 and DDO41 though the submission does not identify individual properties. The submission states:</p> <p>It is argued that the proposed changes will impact on the built form outcomes in Barwon Heads, and unnecessarily introduce requirements that can be managed through other existing or proposed planning controls. Clause 21.06 'Settlement and Housing' aims to provide a for appropriate range of densities and limiting changes and the proposed amendment will compromise this policy objective, amongst others.</p> <p>The proposed rezoning from GRZ1 to NRZ6 blanket application should be modified to apply to targeted areas in the township. The NRZ has a stronger emphasis on one to storey development which is a contrast to the existing GRZ2 provisions which allows up to three storeys. The 9.0m height controls and private open space provisions are generally unchanged from the transition from GRZ2 to the proposed NRZ6 (except for number of storeys). Newer development areas, however, should remain in the GRZ2 to allow for varied development outcomes that can still aim to address coastal character objectives.</p> <p>The proposed DDO41 is also a concern as the introduction of the 40% maximum site coverage, combined with the NRZ garden area requirements and the minimum 30% soft landscaping (free from hard surfaces) is likely to impact on the infill development potential, and should not be supported. DDO41 does not need to be applied to nearly all of Barwon Heads residential areas. Similar to the application of the NRZ6, the DDO41 should be applied to area which require specific</p>	<p>NRZ Drafting</p> <p>The submission requests the NRZ and DDO41 specifically not be applied to Areas 8 and 10 (<i>Barwon Heads Residential and Landscape Character Assessment March 2017</i>). The submission does not state which properties are owned by Mr Hill, which would be useful in gaining a better understanding of the issues raised.</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>focus and in areas that have high visual amenity such as main roads and more established areas.</p> <p>The <i>Barwon Heads Residential and Landscape Character Assessment (March 2017)</i> recommends site coverage of 40% for most residential areas and a response to addressing coastal character (p 44). However, on Page 23 of this same Report it is stated that “site coverage is almost entirely ‘less than 50%’”, with a scattering of lots with a high site coverage of between 50% and 70% and virtually not having a site coverage of more than 70%. The default site coverage at present is 60% in the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme, and it recommended that this remains unchanged, particularly given the inconsistency in the assessment of the existing conditions.</p> <p>Site coverage as defined in Clause 72 the Planning Scheme is “the proportion of a site covered by buildings”. The proposed maximum 40% site coverage is too low and should be increased or removed altogether. The reasons for its deletion from C375 are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Garden Area Requirement was introduced in March 2017 and has not been considered in the Report or in Amendment C375. The coastal character objectives and existing garden area requirements will provide appropriate planning mechanisms to achieve the desired coastal character-built form outcomes;</li> <li>• The combination of the garden area, landscaping and site coverage requirements are onerous and limit infill development and good design outcomes in Barwon Heads. The retention of the landscaping and garden area requirements would provide an appropriate level of planning control to manage the site coverage and setbacks, and importantly achieve the coastal character objectives; and</li> <li>• The buildings and works requirements as set out in 2.0 of DDO41 provides detailed requirements of side and rear setbacks, garage design, landscaping and fencing. The additional inclusion of site coverage will increase the complexity of design and unnecessary in the overall site response given all the other conditions.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed NRZ6 and DDO41 should be modified to exclude most of Area 1, more specifically Areas 8 and 10 in the <i>Barwon Heads Residential and Landscape Character Assessment (March 2017)</i>.</p>	
112	J. Paisley OAM	Golf links Rd Barwon Heads	O	<p>I have been a permanent resident of Barwon Heads for 33 years. I enjoy living here, because of its coastal beauty, pristine wetlands and river and its caring and involved community, which supports a variety of residents and visitors alike, providing a unique but fragile environment.</p> <p>Having attended the Barwon Heads planning meetings organised by the CoGG last year it is disappointing to find that little of importance in the maintenance of the coastal village character is reflected in the Planning Scheme Amendment C375 circulated to Land owners and Occupiers in</p>	IHDA Drafting Vegetation Protection Village Character

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>February 2018.</p> <p>It would appear that because of the application of the blanket application of the IHDA (Increased Housing Diversity Area), coastal villages like Barwon Heads could lose their unique character and charm, hence, their attraction to tourists and residents alike. (Who would wish to forgo the amenities of a city to drive a considerable distance to visit or live amongst a collection of three storey buildings?) It is therefore vital to have this IHDA removed.</p> <p>Barwon Heads has not been designated as a Growth Area. Moreover, the Bellarine Peninsula has, been identified as one of the five areas in this State of Victoria needing to be protected and enhanced.</p> <p>The DDO (Design and Development Overlay) as proposed would not be effective in providing the protections needed, particularly as there would be “as of right” entitlements to develop without requirements to advertise to neighbours. Neither is there the requirement for diversity of heights and density of buildings. Neither are there Neighbourhood Character Overlays to protect heritage buildings or particular streetscapes.</p> <p>The following outcomes for development in a GRZ (General Residential Zone) are not compatible with a low-lying coastal village:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum height of 11 metres (too high)</li> <li>• 60% site coverage (too large)</li> <li>• No minimum lot size</li> <li>• Restrictions/permits only apply if more than one house per block.</li> <li>• BHSP2017 exempts planning permits for single dwellings from advertising required for 11 metre high building covering 60% of block with no third-party appeal rights.</li> <li>• Area 1 is impacted by the west side of Golf Links Road and the north side of Ozone Road.</li> </ul> <p>The DDO (Design &amp; Development Overlay) is inadequate to protect a low-lying coastal village like Barwon Heads from over-development and unsuitable height requirements. There are a number of examples where Rescode has not been followed with consequent detrimental effect on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Vegetation on private land, with the exception of Warrenbeen, is unprotected. Many new buildings are built “from fence to fence” without room even for the one Canopy or Shade Tree cited in Rescode as necessary for each single dwelling.</p>	

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Parking: Parking in Barwon Heads is a constant problem and no longer just during the summer months. Underground Parking is not an alternative in Barwon Heads.. The water table is so high that it can impact on flooding neighbouring properties. In the town centre it is imperative that parking requirements must be adhered to and not, as is too often currently the case,, waived by Council Officers. Parking and Movement Surveys need updating. The volume of Movement in all seasons of the year has increased.</p> <p>The quaint narrow laneways leading down from the town to the river are an important part of the unique character of Barwon Heads and need preservation and to be taken into consideration when applications for developments are received by the Council.</p>	
113	M. Palmer	Flinders Parade Barwon Heads	O	Raises two issues: (1) there is an urgent need for speed humps in Flinders Parade; and (2) no car parking exemptions for new developments.	Movement & Parking
114	V. Palmer	Flinders Parade Barwon Heads	O	Raises two issues: (1) there is an urgent need for speed humps in Flinders Parade; and (2) no car parking exemptions for new developments.	Movement & Parking
115	K. Pearce	<i>Not provided</i>	S	I am totally against expanding the boundary of Barwon Heads. Without leaders in power who recognise and protect areas of special significance we are in danger of becoming one huge suburb with no beauty or character. It is important to protect towns like Barwon heads from the greed of developers and maintain the integrity of this beautiful area so it can be enjoyed for future generations. Yes I understand this limits those who can afford to live here but everyone can afford to come here and swim, walk, have an ice cream or coffee and take part in the endless opportunities this town has to offer.	Settlement Boundary
116	Plan A Planning Pty Ltd	A. Borthwick Director 3-35 Mackay Rd North Geelong VIC 3215	O	<p>Submission on behalf of the owners of 30 Hitchcock Ave, Barwon Heads:</p> <p>We strongly object to the proposed rezoning of land within Barwon Heads from the Residential Growth Zone – Schedule 3 to the Neighbourhood Residential Zone – Schedule 6, and the application of the Design and Development Overlay Schedule 41. We state that the proposed rezoning will stifle development opportunities in the existing township of Barwon Heads, and as such not adequately support nor provide for the increased population growth projected for this coastal township. Reducing the opportunity to provide for infill development and urban consolidation has the potential to result in outward sprawl of Barwon Heads, causing potential loss of; agricultural land, opportunities for urban separation between Barwon Heads and other urbanised areas, and the existing amenity of coastal areas.</p> <p>Further, the proposed changes to the planning scheme significantly contradict the previous findings and recommendations of the Greater Geelong ‘Housing Diversity Strategy 2007’ and the latest finding of the Barwon Heads Structure Plan 2017.</p>	South of Bridge Rd

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>This submission outlines how the proposed rezoning conflicts with previous and current findings and recommendations of this strategic document.</p> <p>The Housing Diversity Strategy (2007) outlined that there is increased growth within the coastal area of the municipality and that the majority of this growth will come from people over the age of 50. Noting that coastal townships are popular as retirement locations. It is also noted that housing to suit this growth includes smaller and more diverse housing types, with the expectation being that less conventional housing will increase in popularity.</p> <p>Similarly the Barwon Heads Structure Plan (2017) identified that Barwon Heads has changed over the years. The percentage of people over 60 years dropped from 30% in the 1980's to 20% in 2011, however the township is again experiencing a high rate of growth for this demographic, and the growth rate had increased to 26% in 2016. Population projections indicate there will be a significant growth in older residents consistent with Australia-wide trends, although Barwon Heads will have a higher proportion of people near or within retirement age. It is noted that community and health services will have to focus on supporting an increasing number of elderly residents. Population forecasts outline the importance of providing a diversified housing stock.</p> <p>Both the Housing Diversity Strategy (2007) and the Barwon Heads Structure Plan (2017) outline that the most appropriate way to provide the additional housing to support the expected population growth is through 'urban consolidation' and 'infill development' resulting in a 'more compact form'. In particular the Housing Diversity Strategy (2007) notes that 'building additional housing within existing urban areas, particularly areas that are well serviced by infrastructure and facilities, reduces development pressure on the urban fringe and more people are able to walk to their daily needs'.</p> <p>Hitchcock Avenue south of Bridge Road offers an opportunity to provide for a mix and range of dwelling types suitable for an aging population, including compact, low-maintenance housing. The proximity of the area to the centre of the township also allows for ease of accessibility to urban services.</p> <p>The Barwon Heads Structure Plan (2017) notes there is currently limited land supply for Barwon Heads, with an anticipated 4-5 years supply in 2015. This number is now likely to be less given 2+ years has passed since the release of the document. It is considered that without the opportunity for urban consolidation and infill development, land supply within the township will diminish at a rapid rate.</p>	

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>The Barwon Heads Structure Plan (2017) outlines that there is currently pressure to expand the township through both the expansion of the 'settlement boundary' and with a particular emphasis along the western boundary by converting agricultural land to residential land. There is considerable lack of policy to support this expansion. We also state that western expansion of Barwon Heads will result in impacts on environmental and coastal areas, flooding/climate change and issues around stormwater discharge.</p> <p>We state that Hitchcock Avenue south of Bridge Road offers an opportunity to provide additional housing supply through consolidated development and increased densities. Development within the area can be designed to mitigate issues including threats to neighbourhood character, while also contributing to the preferred future character of Barwon Heads.</p> <p>The framework notes the implementation of the Neighbourhood Residential Zone and Design and Development Overlay will work in conjunction to protect 'the unique low scale coastal design character of Barwon Heads'. We state however that the application of the Neighbourhood Residential Zone will significantly restrict the opportunity to provide the appropriate level of supply to meet the increasing housing demand. Specifically the proposal to limit site coverage to a maximum of 40% and the implementation of significant height restriction. We state that an appropriate outcome can be achieved through the retention of the Residential Growth Zone.</p> <p>There are many examples of medium-high density development that provide an appropriate response to the existing amenity and character of the area. We therefore state that the rezoning of the land is not required in order to achieve good design outcomes.</p> <p>As documented within the Diverse Housing Strategy (2007) the most appropriate way to provide the additional housing to support the expected population growth is through 'urban consolidation' and 'infill development' resulting in a 'more compact form'. This Strategy notes that 'building additional housing within existing urban areas, particularly areas that are well serviced by infrastructure and facilities, reduces development pressure on the urban fringe and more people are able to walk to their daily needs'.</p> <p>There are many examples of medium-high density development that provide an appropriate response to the existing amenity and character of the area. We state that the rezoning of the land is not required in order to achieve good design outcomes.</p> <p>We also state that Design and Policy tools, including Design and Development Overlay and Clause</p>	

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				55, can be utilised to ensure increased density development can be provided that is sympathetic to the existing character of the area. It is considered that this outcome is more appropriate to address the key areas of concerns for Barwon Heads; population growth and maintaining the 'coastal township character' of the area.	
117	M. Pocock	Barwon Terrace Barwon Heads	O	<p>This Structure Plan comes at a time of enormous developmental pressure on a growing township surrounded by growth areas with limited infrastructure. I see development as positive for the town but not at the expense of destroying it. While the proposed amendments go some way to modifying the detrimental one-size-fits-all approach of the State Government's IHDA, they fail to ensure that the coastal seaside character and heritage of Barwon Heads will be preserved for future residents and holiday-makers to enjoy.</p> <p>11 metres buildings for the shopping precinct, and the neighbouring residential streets, with no control over setbacks, no mention of the importance of vegetation to soften the built forms, no prescriptive assessment of what constitutes 'neighbour character' will lead to an ugly mixture of styles, each one a precedent for further inappropriate matching to coastal styles. To preserve the coastal character of Barwon Heads, as the Structure Plan mission states, buildings need to be aligned with the height of the vegetation, not towering above it.</p> <p>I live in a very sensitive area (Barwon Terrace) which has, in the past, been considered of significance in its bio-diversity yet there is no mention of the protection of an Environmental Significance Overlay Schedule 6 for this area. There should be a 9 metres height restriction for all of Barwon Heads accompanied by a whole-of-town Vegetation Overlay, adjusted for various parts of town. For instance 64 Hitchcock Ave has development plans which will completely denude the block of significant tree covers which has served a purpose in Barwon Heads for many years.</p>	IHDA Vegetation Protection Village Character
118	J. Poulson	Parkdale VIC 3195	O	<p>I have been visiting Barwon Heads regularly since childhood. It has a great natural environment that used to have many varied forms of accommodation. Unfortunately, Barwon Heads has become increasingly 'gentrified' and less inclusive.</p> <p>I am making this submission to highlight the flawed structure of Amendment C375 and the Barwon Heads Structure Plan (BHSP). Council is accepting survey data that does not represent the whole Barwon Heads community for the purpose of preparing future policy and any reference to it should be deleted as being based on an unverified statistical process.</p> <p>There is a significant shortage of housing, services and tourist accommodation within the town. There is virtually no land available and the cost is disproportionate to other coastal localities. The Rondor Caravan Park was closed and subdivided to meet the need for building blocks in Barwon Heads, which has resulted in the loss of about a third of the available camping sites.</p>	Settlement Boundary

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Tourism is Barwon Heads' major economic driver and is important for the survival of the town as more than an upmarket residential suburb. It provides much needed employment and this could be increased by offering more accommodation options and providing better tourist based experiences.</p> <p>I would love to be able to walk or ride around the whole locality and stop off at the many varied points to enjoy or learn about its formation and human connection with place. Tourism is only going to increase with the development of the Asian middle class and employment opportunities are critical in this new digital revolution era and increasing automation.</p> <p>Barwon Heads could comfortably grow by promoting eco housing and future eco tourist development with links to an interconnected 'Round the Heads' trail that could be created through the expansion of the high land to the west of the town boundary. A town boundary change would also improve the quality of life for permanent residents (not only by allowing greater access and interconnection). It would reduce the level of 'over the top' development inside the low lying areas of Barwon Heads and the related stormwater, Movement, parking, services and 'village' atmosphere issues.</p>	
119	J. Prasser	Elizabeth Street Malvern VIC 2144	O	Owens a property in Reid Street and would like to see the height in Area 4 reduced to 9m. Also remove the IHDA from Area 4.	IHDA
120	P. Prasser	Elizabeth Street Malvern VIC 2144	O	<p>The township of Barwon Heads is showing strains given that there is limited space and already the number of people, their vehicles and trailers are overcrowding the town. The drainage, the bridge and the shopping centre are past capacity and these issues cannot easily be rectified given that it is at the end of that part of the land mass.</p> <p>Building at greater density in an area that is already overcrowded is not logical unless a broader development plan is able to be brought forward. It is also noted that the level crossings for pedestrians are fully utilised from the perspective of crowd versus vehicle control. I support the pedestrian crossings, but there is no scope to continually increase the population.</p> <p>This is a case of a small area, which cannot expand, given its location against the river and ocean, against the volume of people that wish to crowd into it. Naturally, this is why I am objecting to allowing greater density.</p>	IHDA
121	N. Prichard	Wandin Court Barwon Heads	O	<p>Being a resident for 22 years I have seen many changes, some for the better and some not as successful planned or well embraced.</p> <p>This small seaside village has been developed considerably quickly from approximately 15 years</p>	IHDA Movement & Parking Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>ago with many families moving for the Sea Change. Areas the ol' farmers along Golf Links Road said they would never develop, have, little pockets of land with the narrowest and dangerous road entry down the River End have been released into small allotments (i.e.: under 650m2) attracting additional residents, more cars. Old larger blocks (approx 1000m2) have been subdivided and redeveloped into 2 and 3 dwellings allowing more families, their vehicles, into this township.</p> <p>This swelling community cannot cater for the existing residents, it sure as well will not cater for any more.</p> <p>Problems: Movement over Summer is horrendous now with 45minutes delays crossing the Barwon Heads Bridge from Barwon Heads to Ocean Grove (visa- versa). Car Parking congestion is abundant all year round. Bird Species and Protected Wildlife are forced to relocate. Pre-school facilities are packed to the rafters with extensive waiting lists. Primary School, even with a recent renovation and additional class rooms are full with just under 500 students. It is highly doubtful the Australian Government will release further grants in the near future to cater for the DREADFULLY POTENTIAL further expansion of Subdivisions.</p> <p>Quality of life is why we live in our Barwon Heads Community. Community being the KEY WORD here. Let's keep the Community Capped as it is now. Our MOTTO is: it takes a Community to Raise a Family New MOTTO: Suburbs create CHAOS</p>	
122	J. Radcliffe-Smith	Knox Drive Barwon Heads	O	<p>As a new resident of Barwon Heads my concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Movement and Pedestrians Due to large scale housing development at Warralily etc and Ocean Grove, there is a continual influx of visitors to the town for all the amenities it and the coast have to offer. Therefore, summer, weekends and holidays Movement and pedestrians are causing chaos.. the crossings need timed lights, allowing cars to proceed at regular intervals.</li> <li>2. Housing density and subdivision should be restricted. Barwon Heads IS NOT A GROWTH AREA. - New housing should accord with the town and neighbourhood character. Barwon Heads is an historic coastal village and building heights should be restricted to 9 metres. 11m is too high. - Adequate parking must be addressed and provided for in any new development. - Trading shops/businesses should be confined to the present delineated shopping precinct and not infringe on private housing.</li> <li>3. Significant vegetation and trees should be protected with tighter controls and a permit needed</li> </ol>	IHDA Settlement Boundary Movement & Parking Vegetation Protection Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>to remove any of the above. The environment and coastal environment should receive protection from over development at all costs.</p> <p>I strongly support and endorse the Barwon Heads Association submission re the Amendment C375.</p>	
123	J & O. Raff	The Strand Newport VIC 3015	O	<p>Overall we are supportive of the amendment and particularly the preamble where the aim is to maintain the unique coastal atmosphere of Barwon Heads.</p> <p>The area we are concerned about is the purple zone, Area 4, which is designated a IHDA (Increase housing density area). The IHDA designation in other areas to provide increase housing around transport hubs such as railway stations and does not seem applicable to the Barwon Heads coastal village concept. We suggest that the purple zone, Area 4, should have the same zoning as the Yellow Zone, Area 1. The purple zone is immediately visible from the bridge and the street scape is essential to the coastal village image.</p> <p>Particulars problem with the high density IHDA zoning for Barwon Heads include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Car parking is a major issue at peak times and there have been a number of developments where car parking requirements have been waived.</li> <li>2. High density buildings often have underground car parking and this area has a high water table and underground water flows which would be significantly disrupted by underground car parking.</li> <li>3. The street scape resulting from high density would be incompatible with the coastal village image. Many of the old homes in the area currently do not have heritage overlays in the area and this situation needs to be corrected to maintain the coastal image.</li> </ol>	IHDA Movement & Parking
124	J. Romeril	Clifford Parade Barwon Heads	O	<p>Area 4 should have a double storey maximum building height and urgent action is required to provide off-street car parking.</p>	IHDA Movement & Parking
125	C. Russell	Campbell Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>As a resident in Campbell Street (Area 5), I strongly agree with the recommendation that the building height limit should be reduced to <u>9 metres</u> and building site coverage from 70% to <u>40%</u>. Proposed design and development should definitely comply with coastal character design requirements and there should be <u>NO Increased Housing Diversity</u> implemented south of Bridge Road.</p> <p>I also believe that all areas of the "old Barwon Heads" - everything south of Geelong Rd and east of Golf Links Rd to the river (mainly Area 4 and all of 5) - should have a 9 metre height limit and a strict restriction to building site coverage. Except for the existing Hitchcock shopping precinct (between Ozone Rd and Bridge Rd) and the Bridge Road shopping precinct (between the eastern corner of Hitchcock Ave and Ewing Blyth Dr) there should be no Increased Housing Diversity.</p>	South of Bridge Rd IHDA Movement & Parking Village Character


No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Barwon Heads was a fishing village and, as such, should retain its 'charm'. We need to protect the unique character of the town as a coastal village. It is a popular destination because of its smaller town size and its charm. Some of the constructions built in recent years are starting to make it look like a suburb of Melbourne. If people want those sort of houses they should build them in the cities.</p> <p>As for the boundaries - again, the charm of the town is its surrounding reserves and farm land. These areas should be protected. It is unclear from the Structure Plan Map, exactly how far the 13th Beach Resort Stage C extends towards the town. I do not believe it should be allowed to 'creep' any closer to the town. If it does continue to grow, they would have to provide their own shopping precinct of supermarket, etc. to service the resort.</p> <p>Barwon Heads is clogged with cars already. There is already limited parking and the roads leading into the town (from both the east and west) are clogged. Approaching from the west, I have seen queues of cars from the corner of Barwon Heads Road and Golf Links Road all the way to the bridge and from the east, all the way back to the Riverview Caravan Park Entrance on the roundabout of C129 and Wallington Rd. With only one way of passing through Barwon Heads, the roads can't handle the Movement. Increasing the size of the town would exacerbate the problem.</p>	
126	M. Sandor	Lawanna Drive Templestowe VIC	O	<p>The submission is summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not support retention of the current settlement boundary</li> <li>• Coming to BH for 35 years and can now afford to live in BH</li> <li>• There is no suitable land of a reasonable size available</li> <li>• In the 2010 Structure Plan there was some optimism that the western boundary might be extended, why does the current plan discount this?</li> <li>• It is inconsiderate to shut other people out of the town</li> <li>• Sensible land release over a number of years could enhance the town</li> <li>• BH needs to provide space like other seaside towns around Geelong</li> </ul>	Settlement Boundary
127	P. Saunders	Hogan Drive Barwon Heads	S	<p>I wish to record my support for Amendment C375 to the Greater Geelong Planning Scheme concerning Barwon Heads and in particular the proposals to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain the current low density urban form,</li> <li>• Prevent urban sprawl by maintaining the existing town boundary,</li> <li>• Protect the unique "coastal village" character,</li> <li>• Ensure that new development complies with coastal character design requirements,</li> <li>• Restrict commercial development to the Hitchcock Avenue precinct.</li> </ul>	Support noted

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				I commend council officers for their thorough and consultative approach to the proposed amendment to the Planning Scheme.	
128	Save Barwon Heads Alliance Inc	c/o 17 River Parade Barwon Heads	S	<p>This 33 page submission is summarised as follows:</p> <p>The Save Barwon Heads Alliance (SBHA) is a group of over 2800 mainly residents of the Bellarine Peninsula. The SBHA supports the Barwon Heads Structure Plan 2017 and Amendment C375.</p> <p>SBHA contends that any residential development in closer proximity to the wetlands than the current developments would be detrimental to the values of the sensitive wetlands, waterways and the threatened biodiversity they support. It would also place unwarranted and unacceptable pressure on the finite coastal infrastructure and amenity of the township, in effect destroying the character of the small coastal township, the very reason it attracts so many visitors year after year.</p> <p>In supporting the Barwon Heads Structure Plan 2017 and Amendment C375, we are informed by science-based international, national, state, regional and local policies and strategies which demonstrate the inherent logic of retaining the settlement boundary in its current position:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SAVE THE WETLANDS - Existing policies and planning documents support protection of sensitive environmental areas surrounding Barwon Heads from the threatening impacts of urban development.</li> <li>2. SAVE THE BOUNDARY - State and local planning policies align with international and national agreements and support protection from threats and specifically limits to growth in highly sensitive coastal environments.</li> <li>3. SAVE BARWON HEAD - The existing amenity of the township that attracts tourists is protected by retaining the settlement boundary</li> </ol> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>SBHA congratulates COGG planners on the excellent research and planning undertaken in development of the Barwon Heads Structure Plan 2017 and the implementing Amendment C375. We support the Amendment C375 statement to exclude residential development from the golf focus stage3 13th Beach Resort development and require demonstrably net environmental benefit. We also support protections for the remnant Moonah Woodland Community.</p> <p>The Barwon Heads Structure Plan (and Amendment C375) recognises the sensitive coastal values inherent in the physical and ecological surrounds of the township and the threat that urban development represents to these values. It aligns with international, national, state and local planning that overwhelmingly supports limits to growth particularly in sensitive coastal areas</p>	<p>Support noted</p> <p>Settlement Boundary</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>where our knowledge is uncertain. Lastly, it respects the amenity value of our Bellarine coastal village, Barwon Heads, which attracts visitors year-round and is defined by non-urban breaks between settlements. The retention of the current settlement boundary is entirely consistent with the logic of planning policy in Victoria for the past 21 years.</p> <p>SBHA members have shown their concern for the wetlands through the 970 submissions to the Structure Plan consultation and well over 600 to Amendment C375. SBHA looks forward to the opportunity to represent its 2800 plus membership at the panel hearing in August 2018 with its legal team and expert witnesses.</p>	
129	P. Schudmak	Fawkner Street South Yarra VIC 3141	O	<p>My wife and her family have owned property in George Street, Barwon Heads for many years.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We wholeheartedly support the retention of the existing Settlement Boundary that will hopefully prevent the urban sprawl all the way from Geelong and it will go some small way to preserving the 'village' atmosphere.</li> <li>2. We feel that the proposed Amendment C375, as it relates to Area 5, is most inappropriate and will do nothing to preserve the 'unique landscape characteristics' of this area (south of Bridge Road). While well intentioned, we feel that Schedule 41 provides positive initial guidance, but longer term many of the requirements will be impossible to fully implement or maintain. We certainly do not support the mandatory construction 'with lightweight, natural and timber materials'. Very few of the existing structures use these materials. And only a few of the existing streets have (in part) any significant naturally treed streetscape.</li> <li>3. While much is made of the proposed height reduction from 10.5 to 9 meters, we feel it is of very little significance as it will still allow the construction of three story buildings. There are only a handful of these in this area at present and this will dramatically change the appearance of the area.</li> <li>4. We feel that the reduction of the site coverage from 70% to 40% will have a most detrimental impact on the future development and appearance of the area, particularly when combined with the 9m height limit. These two factors, combined with the comparatively small sizes of most blocks, will inevitably lead to rows of three story homes close to the road (in the case of properties on the north side of the east-west roads) behind a thin facade of vegetation of "at least one new tree". All of this will lead to a significant change to the 'unique characteristics' of the area.</li> <li>5. The 40% site coverage rule will virtually mandate multi story constructions in order to get anything like optimum use of the available land area and lead to over-shadowing and other negative consequences.</li> <li>6. We feel that a 60% site coverage would lead to a more satisfactory outcome.</li> </ol>	Settlement Boundary South of Bridge Rd
130	C. Shady	Affleck Court Barwon Heads	O	Barwon Heads is a unique and beautiful small town surrounded by a fragile and special environment that needs to be protected. As a resident and the owner of a small business	Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				operating in Hitchcock Avenue I am passionate about maintaining the lovely character of our town. Please help us do that by agreeing to the BHA submission.	
131	A. Shelton	Cosham Court Barwon Heads	S	The earlier decision not to move the Movement out of Barwon Heads by failing to build the bridge off the Old Geelong Rd has had a massive detrimental impact on the quality of life in the village. By supporting this restructure I believe the village life can be protected by controlling the village boundaries. This will also protect the wetlands and its wildlife as well as limit further damage to the water table by any proposed development.	Movement & Parking Settlement Boundary
132	R. Smith	PO Box 1271 Barwon Heads	S	Strongly encourages the completion of the 'round the heads trail' for cyclists and pedestrians.	Support noted. Implementing the trail will dependent on detailed design, budget availability and coordination with other agencies.
133	B & R. Smith	Warrenbeen Court Barwon Heads	O	<p>We, landowners of Warrenbeen Court <u>strongly oppose</u> the City of Greater Geelong (COGG) proposed Amendment C375 of the Barwon Heads Structure Plan.</p> <p>Our main causes for objection are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The introduction of a minimum subdivision lot size of 4000m2. One of the key considerations we made when purchasing the above-mentioned property in 2009 was that the restrictive covenant would expire in 2020. This timeline provided us with a vision and opportunity to subdivide our property at some time in the future. By introducing the proposed minimum, the COGG are significantly reducing the value of our land and property which we have invested in for not only ours, but our children's future. A proposed alternative for the council, would be to allow existing property owners to split their land in half, therefore retaining street appeal and character but also providing value for landowners that was once promised. This fair proposal is one which residents can only assume was originally intended, given all properties in the street have dual numberings e.g. 10-11 etc.</li> <li>The implementation of the Environmental Significance Overlay. This overlay is not practical in nature but one that results in significant risk of fire danger. The above-mentioned overlay would create dense, fire fuelling vegetation in the form of trees and wide spread undergrowth. We propose that a Vegetation Protection Overlay would be more appropriate.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the above, we have attached a submission that was completed by Tomkinson Group on behalf of ourselves and a fellow neighbour, on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2017. This document further highlights our concerns and reiterates our position on the proposed changes.</p>	Warrenbeen Crt

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				We also wish to note that the COGG engagement with us and fellow residents and landowner's of Warrenbeen Court has been poor. Following our submission through Tomkinson Group, no engagement, correspondence or feedback was received by any of the mentioned parties.	
134	J. Snell	Carr Street Barwon Heads	O	Submits that there be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no increase in housing density</li> <li>no increase in town boundaries</li> <li>height restrictions as suggested</li> </ul>	IHDA
135	W. Spitty	Moffat Street South Yarra VIC 3141	O	<p>I own a residence in Talbot St which is in Area 4 and intended to be rezoned General Residential Zone. I am extremely concerned regarding the proposed change to my street and the surrounding area. The crucial factors are that the river frontage and coastal village atmosphere are not ruined by over-development which would result from the increased height restrictions. The height limits would allow for increased density of buildings and residents, with no thought to the tourist appeal of the river and its shoreline, vegetation which is already vulnerable, or to the increase of already congested Movement conditions and lack of parking along the beachfront and the main streets. There is already a lack of transport infrastructure in this area and any inducements to increase building density would be extremely detrimental to the amenity of this area.</p> <p>In regard to Talbot St specifically, which is a dead-end gravel road; there are restricted parking opportunities especially during peak holiday periods. Also, refuse trucks can only access this street in one direction because there is no room to turn around, so all residents' garbage bins have to be put out on one side of the street (avoiding parked cars and driveways) which can be almost impossible at times. So if density is increased, there will be a huge problem with waste collection.</p> <p>In summary, the attraction of Barwon Heads as a tourist destination relies heavily on its small-town coastal village atmosphere and it is also the reason many residents choose to live there. By allowing Area 4 to increase in density without proper planning for road infrastructure, parking and transport, access for public utilities and vegetation protection, it will have a devastating effect on the amenity of Barwon Heads and the wider region of the Bellarine Peninsula.</p>	IHDA Village Character
136	M. Sprague	Ewing Blyth Dr Barwon Heads	O	The submission questions the rezoning of Area 4 to the GRZ, particularly how it will affect the exiting Flinders Heritage Area. The new height limits and density contradicts objectives of the heritage area. Area 5 should be extended north of Bridge Rd to incorporate the Flinders Heritage Area. When Council receives a new 3 storey development application within the Flinders Heritage Area, which height limit applies?	IHDA
137	St Quentin Consulting	B. O'Loan PO Box 919 Geelong Vic	O	Submission on behalf of a consortium of landowners which totals just under 40 hectares north of Barwon Heads Rd (135 Taits Road: J. Grant, M. Boyd, J. Oliver/ 137 Taits Road: L. Crawford/ 1941-1949 Barwon Heads Rd: D. Fisher).	Settlement Boundary Listing 'flawed'

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
		3220		 <p>The submission objects to Amendment C375 summarised as follows:</p> <p><u>Growth</u> The BHSP not only dismisses the notion of expanding the settlement boundary, but also restricts development within the settlement boundary. C375 is therefore not consistent with the SPPF.</p> <p><u>Wetlands</u> The BHSP should remove all arguments for not extending the western boundary due to the potential impacts on significant biodiversity and sensitive environments, because this is simply unsubstantiated.</p> <p><u>Alternative types of development</u> An expansion to the western boundary could involve well-planned development with large separation distances to environmental values, plenty of parkland and vegetation, integrated water management, highly sustainable development outcomes and great linkages to the existing town.</p> <p><u>Flawed community consultation methods</u> Council should remove any claim from the BHSP that the decision not to extend the western boundary is due to significant community opposition.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u> Although the BHSP acknowledges the lack of land supply in Barwon Heads, it does not offer any</p>	<p>community consultation methods' as a reason for the objection is curious. The submission states: "the BHSP relies heavily on significant community opposition to development" and goes on to refer to the SBHA campaign.</p> <p>Engaging with the community in any comprehensive strategic review process would be considered standard practice. When developing a 'vision' for any place it would be reasonably expected that those with a direct interest would have an opportunity to shape the plan. Preparation of the BHSP included extensive consultation and the substantial support for retaining the current settlement boundary is clearly a relevant factor in Council's decision.</p> <p>As addressed in the BHSP section 3.3.1, there are a number of factors that support the settlement boundary</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				method of achieving growth in Barwon Heads. C375 also reduces the potential for infill development. We consider that a western expansion of the settlement boundary could achieve a net community benefit by addressing the limited land supply in Barwon Heads, and also providing land supply for other basic services that are needed by the existing community.	decision irrespective of community sentiment.
138	R. Stephens	Golf Links Rd Barwon Heads	?	<i>No attached submission.</i>	Noted.
139	L. Stinson	Seaview Avenue Barwon Heads	S	Supports retention of the current settlement boundary.	Settlement Boundary
140	L. Stinson	Seaview Avenue Barwon Heads	O	Area 4 should not allow 3 storeys to the north of Ozone Road and car parking should not be waived for new houses.	IHDA Movement & Parking
141	P. Stock	Seabank Drive Barwon Heads	S	Supports the Barwon Heads Structure Plan and commends Council for the consultation process. Says the plan reflects the views of the community living in Barwon Heads.	Support noted
142	A. Stockman	Golightly Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>A drastic change to the residential zone is proposed to some properties according to Amendment C375. As you can see my property is in area 5. I am most concerned in particular about proposed major reduction in building site coverage from 70-40%. This preclude my family from extending the modest house on this site, something I was planning to do in the future. No other part of Barwon Heads has been affected to such drastic extent as area 5. The reason? "the area has unique landscape" I see no difference in landscape to the area north of Bridge Rd. I happy to be shown the "unique landscape". I would have thought that the landscape close to the river is unique, yet no proposed changes are made there.</p> <p>In my opinion this change devalues my property (and other neighbouring properties not recently extended/renovated) because it restricts the opportunity for improvement. If this was on the agenda for some time why has the council allowed large buildings occupying over 80% of land just north of my property to be erected in the last 5 years?</p> <p>I am also unhappy that I have not been notified about this proposed change until recently, yet the council did not have a problem finding my address in Melbourne for rates notification!</p>	South of Bridge Rd
143	M. Street	Carr Street Barwon Heads	S	<p>Barwon Heads is a unique place and the Council is to be applauded in its efforts to provide greater certainty for residents in their endeavours to preserve the special character of Barwon Heads.</p> <p>I wholeheartedly endorse the eight bullet points outlined as 'Key policy directions for Barwon Heads'; and any move away from one or more of those points would, in my opinion, jeopardise that unique character, to the permanent detriment of residents and visitors alike.</p> <p>With respect to Movement flows, in reality there are only a handful of days during the year, mainly in January and holiday weekends when Movement could be considered busy and even</p>	Support noted

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>then only at certain times during those days. At this stage, Movement and parking are manageable and that could be further assisted given a little more common sense and less selfish attitude from some of the pedestrian Movement when they cross the road.</p> <p>I am strongly in favour of retaining the existing rural zones outside the settlement boundary. Any move to the contrary would occasion irreversible damage to the community, more specifically the environment and ambience, as we know it today.</p> <p>It is to be hoped that money from developers and the chance to cash in on 'windfall profits' for a couple of landholders does not outweigh the common sense, and decent approach from the Council which, as set out, is clearly for the benefit of the township and tourists both now and for future generations.</p> <p>I also support the views of Council re the future development of Stage C of the 13th Beach Resort. I am also in favour of the proposed residential zone and overlay changes.</p>	
144	G. Tamblyn OAM & S. Tamblyn	Warrenbeen Crt Barwon Heads	O	<p>The submitters own a property in Warrenbeen Court and say the introduction of a minimum subdivision lot size of 4,000sqm is totally unacceptable. They say this retrospective action was not communicated to the residents at any time when purchasing their properties. This action is totally unconscionable. The submission states:</p> <p><u>Proposed NRZ</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When the area was developed, a covenant was placed on all Warrenbeen Crt titles restricting development and further subdivision. The Covenant expires in December 2020, which is a clear indication that the intent was not to impose controls in perpetuity, but rather guide initial development. This is further supported by the current zoning.</li> <li>2. The NRZ with a minimum lot size of 4,000sqm amounts to back-zoning and is disadvantageous, discriminatory and retrospective. Back-zoning does not promote good planning outcomes.</li> <li>3. Because further extension of the BH town boundary has been abandoned it behoves Council to maintain residential zoned land available for infill development.</li> <li>4. There is no reason why lots in Warrenbeen Crt would not be able to support more than one lot subdivision whilst maintaining their existing street character and style. It may be that 1500-2000sqm is more appropriate.</li> <li>5. Many residents are looking forward to ageing in place and providing for additional family members to share and enjoy the current amenity. This proposed back-zoning will prevent reasonable intentions for land use.</li> <li>6. At no stage has CoGG ever mentioned that covenants exist on all properties in Warrenbeen</li> </ol>	Warrenbeen Crt

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Crt up to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020.</p> <p>7. It has come to the notice of Warrenbeen Crt residents that: (a) no objections to the NRZ have had their suggestions for alternatives reflected in the BHSP; and (b) there was a reticence of CoGG staff to even acknowledge receipt of such objections.</p> <p><u>Environmental Significance Overlay</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Warrenbeen Crt patch of Moonah may be a feature of the subdivision, but it is by no means the solitary outpost of native vegetation in the area or in the healthiest condition.</li> <li>2. Warrenbeen Crt is not a new development area – it has long been zoned and developed for residential use, which should be the primary consideration of current policy.</li> <li>3. In Warrenbeen Crt development has already occurred and it is not feasible or viable to expect landowners in an established residential area to begin land management.</li> <li>4. A VPO would be more appropriate, since it is only vegetation that Council seeks to protect.</li> </ol>	
145	D. Telford	George Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>We are concerned with a number of aspects of the proposed amendments to Area 5.</p> <p>The reduction in building site coverage from 70% to 40% will severely restrict development. From a quick assessment of the overhead images of George Street and its surrounding streets a 40% developed area appears to be the exception rather than the rule. In particular, there are very few single blocks on which the footprint is at that level. As such, it isn't clear how the proposed amendment is preserving a neighbourhood feel.</p> <p>The requirement for a minimum 2m offset on at least one boundary will also severely limit development of single blocks. It also seems to be much more restrictive than current offsets, so it is difficult to understand what the amendment is preserving as there are certainly many examples of properties without this level of offset.</p> <p>The effect of the amendments is to limit the footprint of new housing in the area. This will result in people building up, which has a greater impact on neighbours and the street scape than utilising more of a block with a single story dwelling.</p> <p>While it is admirable that the amendments are aimed at preserving the coastal feel of the area, it is arguably too late. There are already a significant number of houses in the area that would not be consistent with our understanding of the proposed requirements. As such, the changes seem to be an exercise in endeavouring to return the horse to barn.</p> <p>We would like to understand what is meant by 'unique landscape characteristics' being best managed by the NRZ.</p>	South of Bridge Rd

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
146	Thirteenth Beach Estate	D. Lipshut Chair, Owners Corporation No. 1	S	<p><u>Introduction</u></p> <p>The Owners Corporation No. 1 (OC1) represents the interests of the community at the 13th Beach Resort. The residential community, which is still growing, has well over 100 houses and almost 100 apartments, and includes a hotel and other short stay accommodation. Within the Resort, there is also a well-established golf club with over 1,000 members.</p> <p>At a recent meeting of the OC1 Committee, it was resolved that OC1 should indicate its support for the proposed 13th Beach Trail. This submission reflects that decision by the Committee, which is made on behalf of all owners and residents. Specifically, this submission relates to clause 5.3.2 “Barwon Coast Committee of Management”.</p> <p>The submission goes on to provide evidence of support by residents and owners and further states: Referring to the Structure Plan’s map titled “Community &amp; Recreational Facilities” (page 89), it appears in that the ‘Indicative Round the Heads Trail’ stops short of the 13th Beach Surf Life Saving Club and the 13th Beach Resort. It is missing key sections of the 13th Beach Trail. The Trail should be extended to allow direct access by residents of the 13th Beach Resort. This would expand patronage of the Trail and allow safe pedestrian and bicycle access between Barwon Heads and 13th Beach Resort.</p> <p>In order to help realise the wishes of many owners and residents, OC1 stands ready to offer input to the designs (and help to finalise plans) as they are being developed. Clearly, use of the existing gate between the 13th Beach Resort and the carpark close to the 13th Beach Life Saving Club clubhouse should be factored into the design. However, if the design calls for an access point at another location, when the Trail is being constructed, OC1 would be prepared to install a secure gate (one that is similar to the existing gate) where the path meets the perimeter of the 13th Beach Resort (this commitment is subject to a decision of the OC1 Committee at that time)</p> <p><u>Next Steps</u></p> <p>We understand that Council will consider submissions both in favour and opposing the construction of the 13th Beach Trail. We recognise that some may object, but we ask that Council rigorously tests these for their veracity and importance. We also ask that OC1 has an opportunity to respond to any objections that may be submitted.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>The 13th Beach Trail has been proposed for more than 20 years without significant action. OC1 supports action and submits that its design and construction should be progressed as soon as</p>	<p>Support noted</p> <p>The BHSP supports the construction of a path along 13<sup>th</sup> Beach Rd and the ‘Round the Heads Trail’. Both projects will improve access for 13<sup>th</sup> Beach Resort residents.</p> <p>The exhibition of C375 did not result in any opposing submissions to these trails.</p> <p>The structure plan map is a high-level plan that is indicative only. Detailed planning &amp; engineering will be required to determine final designs. Clearly, significant ecological values will need to be addressed.</p> <p>Council and Barwon Coast CoM will continue to work with the OC1 to plan and construct the trails.</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
147	T. Travotzki	Coppards Road Moolap	O	<p>possible.</p> <p>I can't tell you our surprise and disappointment to find out that no new land was being released for sale in Barwon Heads. I have lived in Moolap all my life and have been a regular holiday maker in Barwon Heads since early childhood. It has always been our long term goal to retire in Barwon Heads and now the time has come (several years ago in fact) and there is no land available and no plans to release more. I am dumbfounded that this is still the case after 3 years when there is plenty of land that could be subdivided into larger lots that would not affect the town centre congestion. It confuses me why they would want to squash more development into the tiny town centre when it could easily be spread out and not have people living on top of each other. I don't know what town planning was thinking by rezoning Barwon Heads medium density and making the town a great big congested mess. What about supplying the town with a practical shopping precinct which is so badly needed? If the residents of Barwon Heads didn't have to cross the bridge to Ocean Grove, that in itself would relieve an enormous amount of Movement and cater to the increasingly ageing community, some of whom struggle to even get to Ocean Grove. With a population of over 4000 residents, you would think Barwon Heads could, at the very least have a Coles or Woolworths and other shops that are not just for visiting tourists.</p> <p>At this point I fear for the future of Barwon Heads and worry that my favourite place in the whole world will be ruined by the lobbyist groups who will say anything just to keep their town locked down and not available to people hoping to move there in the future. My main concern is that medium density will completely destroy Barwon Heads and increase congestion in inner Barwon Heads. I can only hope that common sense will prevail one day and this beautiful town will be able to progress as most other seaside towns have without destroying the country feel which is so attractive to us.</p>	Settlement Boundary
148	M. Tucker	Mooroopna Crt Barwon Heads	O	<p>Firstly Congratulations for developing the plan. I would like the CGG to do their best to ensure the longevity of this plan. My objection relates to the vision for the shopping area in particular a 20 year parking position.</p> <p>I would like to see a vision and action plan on the following lines. Hitchcock Ave will be a highly regarded strip shopping area on the Bellarine Peninsula. The measurement of the success of this vision will be related to the amount of "stopping Movement" and the success of the retail area. - Car counting and observation cameras will be installed for counting purposes.-</p> <p><b>A/ Implementation: Between Ozone Rd and the Bridge Rd Roundabout</b> There will be no private residential property by 2030. The residential blocks will be zoned either retail or car park. The council will entice this by implementing a grandfather scheme. The current</p>	Movement & Parking

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>owner will be the last owner of the block under "Residential" zone. Their rates will be halved until 2025 when the rates will be increased to commercial rates.</p> <p>The CoGG will establish car parking zones for a minimum of 500 cars with access from the East of Hitchcock Ave from 2025. Will be a one-way Movement from 2020 with an option in the long-term (2025) to be pedestrian Movement mall from October to March.</p> <p><b>B/ Implementation:</b> From 2018 The land at the rear of the IGA to Hitchcock avenue will be designated as a two story car park (allowing for expansion of the IGA on the Bridge Rd side of that area) The car park owner may charge up to \$XX per hour / day. To be built by 2020.</p>	
149	S. Tuddin	Branch Rd Bayswater North, VIC 3153	S	Satisfied with the proposed changes.	Support noted
150	S. Tunnell-Jones	PO Box 1322 Barwon Heads	S	Particularly supportive of: (1) Area 4 reduction of building site coverage; and (2) Area 5 reduction of building site coverage.	Support noted
151	S & A. Van Den Nouwland	Warrenbeen Crt Barwon Heads	O	<p>We, landowners of Warrenbeen Court strongly oppose the City of Greater Geelong (COGG) proposed Amendment C375 of the Barwon Heads Structure Plan. When purchasing our property, we did so with the knowledge we would be able to apply to subdivide in 2020. We purchased our block with our children's and our future in mind, having the option to be able to subdivide. In effect, you are proposing to take away our choices as the landowner.</p> <p>I have planted hundreds of Moonah and Bellarine Yellow gum throughout Warrenbeen Court, our property and the adjoining reserve have benefitted, the first 7 years I mowed and weeded/remove box thorn to encourage the native trees I planted to grow. We have managed our property for the last 18 years, keeping native vegetation and watering the Moonah Trees, we bear the cost of managing branch removal to keep the trees healthy due to all our trees are eaten out/hollowed and snap if they are let to grow naturally.</p> <p>If the Council really want to protect the Moonah Trees of Barwon Heads let alone Warrenbeen Court they should reduce the Possum numbers, during November &amp; December Moonah trees undergo new growth, they flower in January through February however native Possums reduce this new growth to nothing.</p> <p>Our previous history of our native vegetation and trees management would appear to stand for nothing, making changes to how we can manage our property through Neighbourhood Residential rezoning will not achieve anything at all, our property is 2960 m2, going buy the numbers all we need to keep 35% native vegetation on our property, how does this save the Moonah trees.</p>	Warrenbeen Crt


No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>It also appears in my opinion Warrenbeen Court is being unfairly singled out, you only have to drive around Barwon Heads to see there are many Moonah trees in varied locations. I believe with a common sense and ethical approach to subdivision 2 homes on one acre would still allow significant Moonah to remain. Thus, increasing council's rateable properties within the town boundary.</p> <p>I believe if you change the zoning or converts on our land now you will lessen our asset considerably. I believe its unethical and unfair that the draft structure plan would consider taking our choices away.</p>	
152	S. Van Den Nouwland	Warrenbeen Crt Barwon Heads	O	This is a separate submission. Says they are not rich people from Melbourne but working class people who hope to pay off the mortgage and make improvements or rent to help with income. The amendment will significantly reduce resale value of their property.	Warrenbeen Crt
153	K. Waddell	Somers Ave Malvern VIC 3144	O	Agrees with the changed height limit to Area 5 but objects to the building site coverage reduction from 70% to 40%. Says this is too onerous and a more appropriate reduction would be 50-55%.	South of Bridge Rd
154	A. Waite	PO Box 1086 Barwon Heads	O	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The boundary remains at its present position.</li> <li>2. Building heights remain at 2 storeys.</li> <li>3. That parking not be waived.</li> <li>4. That the coastal village remain, vegetation and river bed is protected.</li> <li>5. That CoGG actively support the VicRoads extension of the ring road over the Barwon River to Portarlington Rd to try and reduce passing Movement.</li> </ol>	Settlement Boundary IHDA Movement & Parking Vegetation Protection Village Character
155	G. Waite	PO Box 1086 Barwon Heads	O	<p>I agree with the submissions made by both the BHA and the Save Barwon Heads Alliance. The town boundary should not be changed for at least another 50 years. The coastal village character must be maintained like villages in Europe or else become part of the great Australian sprawl, by:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the boundary, western, remain at its present position.</li> <li>• That building heights remain at two storeys.</li> <li>• That parking not be waived. With the current waiving of parking, people living in or visiting buildings are not able to park near to their destination. What is the point of building new restaurants when the customers cannot park nearby?</li> <li>• That the coastal village remain just that. That vegetation be protected, that appalling and badly run jobs, like the storm outlet into the river not occur to ruin our beach and waste money by not investigating the situation before beginning said job, as in lack of knowledge of river bed material.</li> <li>• That the CoGG support actively the Vic Roads extension of the ring road over the Barwon river to the Port Arlington road to try and reduce the huge amount of Movement passing</li> </ul>	Settlement Boundary IHDA Movement & Parking Vegetation Protection Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				through our narrow streets.	
156	W. Wall	Grandview Parade Barwon Heads	O	<p>Area 5 is cited to apply to south of Bridge Rd for the purpose of protecting the unique landscape characteristics of the identified Area 5. Why does Area 5 not extend to north of Bridge Rd and to Grandview Parade/Margate Street eastwards? What benefit is provided by increasing the height and density of this area north of bridge road? This area is similarly unique to Area 5 as identified due to the proximity to the river and history of the area.</p> <p>The increase in height rather than a decrease, and increase in density, fails to protect the unique coastal character of this area. Further, the combination of the height increase in this area without any set back requirements together with the narrow roads will result in a tunnelling effect from the street. Again diminishing the unique coastal setting of Barwon Heads.</p> <p>The value of Barwon Heads as a unique village within Victoria and wider Australia will be diminished by the increase of height restrictions and density. Preserving Barwon Heads as a coastal town in its current form will identify and define the Geelong region. Town planning instruments should protect the town from development that does not respect the unique coastal setting.</p> <p>There are many examples across the world where the leadership of local government to refrain from promoting housing development through height and density increases that risk damaging the unique and distinctive area from unnecessary development has led to invaluable benefits to the immediate community, environment and the wider economy.</p> <p>The policy that urban development does not occur outside the town boundary is supported.</p>	IHDA Settlement Boundary Village Character
157	G. Wallace Smith	George Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>The submission requests consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintaining village character</li> <li>• Past mistakes such as the new bridge and Movement from Ocean Grove to Geelong</li> <li>• Over development resulting in on-street parking</li> <li>• Barwon Heads not being a growth area</li> <li>• The IHDA is not suitable for village usage</li> </ul>	IHDA Movement & Parking Village Character
158	J. Wallace Smith	George Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>I am very concerned with the rate of development in our little coastal town. It is not a designated growth area &amp; there should be a Structure Plan that will actually protect the character of this coastal environment with its river &amp; wetlands making this a unique &amp; special area.</p> <p>I agree with the Area 5 reduction in height &amp; site coverage of 40 percent with the character &amp; environment of older Barwon Heads being considered but, even so, large areas of old Barwon</p>	IHDA South of Bridge Rd Movement & Parking Village Character

No	Name	Address	T y p e	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>Heads are vulnerable to large scale ad hoc development that doesn't require advertising. I think it is important that residents in adjoining properties are notified about proposed developments thus allowing opportunities to resolve issues with reliable planning.</p> <p>We need a reliable standard footprint for housing, allowing for landscape gardens with porous areas &amp; adequate parking. The more specific built design seem to be ignored, resulting in 2 storey box-style developments with little or no landscaping (probably for holiday renting) &amp; no protection for neighbourhood character &amp; coastal setting &amp; we run the risk of being over-run by this type of development.</p> <p>The extensive area that has been identified by the arbitrary radial distance of 400 metres from the town centre is quite ridiculous for our town centre as it extends into the river! Remove completely or reduce the radial distance to exclude areas west of Golf Links Rd., north of Ozone Rd. within the Flinders Heritage area.</p> <p>The Movement problems are at the forefront of our important issues with a highway through the town all year for commuters &amp; at least 4 or 5 months for holiday makers &amp; more for weekenders! If it wasn't for the pedestrian crossings, life would be considerably more dangerous for walkers &amp; cyclists! As much as I was against "lights" in the town, with vehicles being held up so much, the only solution could be red/green pedestrian lights which would hurry the pedestrians across &amp; make them wait for their turn! (I use the crossings a lot!).</p> <p>The final really difficult problem is the lack of parking! As nobody seems interested in the "Old Kindergarten", it is a wonderful area, quite large &amp; just behind the middle of the main street! It would be a real bonus to the local businesses!! I'm sure the Council would "win a lot of Brownie points" for looking after such a constant &amp; frustrating situation in our delightful part of the world!</p>	
159	E. Webb	Ibis Court Barwon Heads	O	<p>I object to the amendment due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The amendment encourages intense and unsuitable development within Barwon Heads.</li> <li>2. Barwon Heads is a coastal village and is situated within a fragile coastal environment. This village character and the environment will be damaged with increases to the population the higher density developments will bring.</li> <li>3. Barwon Heads has a small activity centre with a number of shops. The main street and the roads are often already congested and parking is hard to find. Increasing development heights and density will exacerbate this issue, as will the constant waiver of parking requirements for new buildings and dwellings.</li> <li>4. Barwon Heads has one primary school with most of the students living within the town. Barwon Heads has one main road from Geelong, through the centre of the town and leading</li> </ol>	<p>IHDA Vegetation Protection Village Character</p> <p>The (sometimes) uneasy relationship between providing improved pedestrian connectivity (i.e. footpaths) and preserving the informal streetscape is discussed</p>

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>over the bridge towards ocean grove. This road is inexplicably directed right past the primary school with Movement outside the school a constant worry and concern to parents and teachers due to the dangers it poses to student safety. Increasing development density will add to Movement along these roads and increase the dangers to students and pedestrians.</p> <p>5. Many people enjoy cycling and walking within the town. Many roads do not have footpaths so cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles are sharing roads. Increasing development heights and density will increase Movement, which will increase dangers to cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>6. Every day I hear the roar of the chainsaws and tree mulch truck. It signals that another block has been sold, subdivided - increasingly into three lots and all the trees and flora on the block completely removed. Where are the protections for the environment when people are allowed to do this?</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Height restrictions should be for 2 stories for all developments throughout the town.</li> <li>2. Parking requirements for new developments need to be enforced.</li> <li>3. Subdivision of blocks should be discouraged and the size of allowed blocks should be increased.</li> </ol>	in the BHSP p.16. This is most pronounced in the IHDA. The BHSP identified Special Rates & Charges Schemes (see Submission no. 70) as one method to achieve an improved pedestrian network.
160	D. Weeks	Taits Road Barwon Heads	O	<p>In Support of: The Neighbourhood Residential Zone being considered for most of Barwon Heads, allowing a maximum 9m building height - with these limits being enforced. Policy on urban development to ensure development does not extend outside the current defined settlement boundary.</p> <p>Objection to: IHDA overlay allowing up to 11m development in General Residential Zones - allows for excessive development and negatively impacts residential amenity and coastal character. Barwon Heads is not a growth area. It currently has flooding and storm water issues plus environmental concerns (protection of vegetation and mature trees) and Movement issues, all of which will be exacerbated by allowing developments of this scale.</p>	IHDA NRZ Vegetation Protection
161	T. Wheeler	PO Box 1065 Barwon Heads	O	<p>According to the structure plan draft, COGG believes it has had some success preserving the village character. The village character was destroyed long ago! A house currently under construction on the block on the corner of Reid St and Ozone St, Barwon Heads is typical of the type of development (3 storeys on 400m<sup>2</sup>) which has been approved by the planning department and IS at the expense of said village appeal. Building like this conflict with the small cottages with made the draft support more of the same and actually increasing the density in central Barwon Heads, the area most affected by these changes and particularly parking with no solution in sight. Many sea changers actually moved to Barwon Heads to get away from the problems we now face.</p> <p>Barwon Heads cannot escape its popularity to prospective residents (many Melbourne</p>	Settlement Boundary IHDA Village Character  Carr St properties do indeed directly front the Lake Connewarre Nature Conservation Reserve/Barwon River. This old subdivision

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				<p>retiree's) and fast growing tourist population in Victoria makes it inevitable that pressure will continue to grow. There is no reasonable argument for not moving the boundary! The fact that the clearly defined boundary has been in place for over 30 years is not an argument for retaining the boundary but a reason for long overdue change.</p> <p>Why is it considered necessary for the huge buffer of over 500 metres to be maintained from the western boundary to Murtnaghurt paleo channel to save the wetlands from ruin but development on the east side of Barwon Heads on Carr St, where properties front the mangroves (part of the Ramsar system) are not considered a concern. A recent planning application for 92 Carr St subdivision there was only one submission opposing the plan in a community who claim to be concerned about the future of the wetlands. Why was MacAfee's proposal for the development at 1920 Barwon Heads Rd, Geelong strongly opposed by COGG &amp; SBHA for being too close to Murtnaghurt Lagoon when 4 Loop St, 13<sup>th</sup> Beach Estate was situated closer to Murtnaghurt Lagoon and was passed with no community resistance?</p> <p>Why is the SBO in the centre of Barwon Heads being supported for medium density (with the flooding associated problems identified in the structure plan) and Bridge Rd South area and the area outside western settlement boundary ignored as options (both DO NOT have potential flooding problems)? Residents continuously talk of the impact of climate change but are prepared to overlook their own problems when it suits their cause of retaining the Barwon Heads clearly defined boundary. Environmental arguments are selective and questions should be asked. Clearly defined boundaries generally change over time, where suitable land is available and pressures of a growing population require change.</p> <p>In the case of Barwon Heads, after a lengthy 30 year period of rapid population growth we desperately need more land made available. There are many strong arguments to be made for change in Barwon Heads and the COGG must reassess the recommendations of the current draft!</p>	<p>design would fail to meet current planning policies.</p> <p>Fourth Loop is a residential enclave approximately 100m from the boundary of the Lake Connewarre Nature Conservation Reserve, which includes Murtnaghurt Lagoon. This land is in the CDZ and development must accord with the Incorporated Document dated September 2006.</p>
162	D. White	Hitchcock Ave Barwon Heads	O	<p>Units are used for occupation not just holiday letting Movement lights are safer for road crossing for elder residents Parking is a big worry in the main street.</p>	Movement & Parking
163	B. Wilson	Margate Street Barwon Heads	O	<p>The submitter is a long term resident and has a vested interest in maintaining the coastal character of the town. It is almost beyond belief that an 11m height limit is being considered for Area 4. How can this represent coastal character? I hope this new Council can show initiative and leadership in planning and development for our future. The submission includes a drawing:</p>	IHDA Village Character

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				 <p>The painting depicts a bright yellow taxi cab parked on a wooden pier or walkway. In the background, a city skyline is visible across a body of water, with buildings in shades of blue and orange. The sky is a mix of dark blue and orange, suggesting a sunset or sunrise. The water reflects the colors of the sky and buildings. The overall style is impressionistic and colorful.</p>	
164	J. Wilson	PO Box 1052 Barwon Heads	O	<p>I am disappointed with the proposal with respect to the increase in height availability to 3 stories. Recently there are two new buildings, one in Ozone Road and one under construction Bridge Road that are examples of what is wrong. There appears to have been no consideration for the neighbours who now have massive structures that take up most the block overlooking the neighbouring properties casting shadows etc. Surely this is unreasonable. This proposal has the potential to destroy the atmosphere of Barwon Heads. It is certainly unfair to the immediate neighbours who are very upset. I have yet to speak to a local who has a kind word for these proposals.</p> <p>I also note the lack of car parking and impact in the immediate vicinity with these very large developments. Surely again any decision must ensure that adequate parking is provided on the properties, but this appears not to have been considered. Barwon Heads is becoming more and more congested and I would encourage you to be more aware of the impact of decisions on the current residents.</p>	<p>IHDA Movement &amp; Parking</p> <p>The developments identified either did not require a planning permit (Reid St) or was exempt from notice provisions (Bridge Rd).</p>
165	V & G. Wright	Ardoch Street Essendon VIC 3040	O	<p>The submission is from a property owner of Warrenbeen Court. Objection to the rezoning (to NRZ) as they are private residences not state parks. The original subdivision should never have been granted. There is evidence that much of the subdivision is degraded and no longer native moonah woodland.</p>	Warrenbeen Crt

No	Name	Address	Type	Summary of Submission	Issue & Response (where required)
				The Council is really trying to placate a vocal group of residents in Barwon Heads to the detriment of those that own a residence in Warrenbeen Court. We would not have purchased had we known of this. The proposed amendment has already had a detrimental impact on our property values.	
166	N. Yates	Fourth Loop, Connewarre VIC 3227	O	My concern, or more a request, is that the coastal path along Thirteenth Beach Road be extended to reach the 13th Beach Life Saving Club. It seems it just falls short of this.	Refer to Submission no. 146.
167	Dept. of Environment, Land, Water & Planning <i>(late submission)</i>	C. Tesselaar Planning Approvals Barwon SW Region PO Box 103 GEELONG 3220	S	DELWP has provided information and feedback to Council throughout review of the Barwon Heads Structure Plan, and is pleased to see this work culminate in the proposed amendment. DELWP notes that the amendment is consistent with matters DELWP raised in earlier feedback on the structure plan.  I advise that DELWP supports the amendment.	Support noted
168	F. Miller <i>(late submission)</i>	George St Barwon Heads	O	The property is an aging Californian Bungalow style dwelling on a 540 square metre lot created many decades ago. Heritage Overlay HO1670 applies to the property. A Special Building Overlay applies to the property due to the AHD level of the land. I am concerned at the proposed imposition of a 40 per cent maximum site coverage standard to be imposed under a Design and Development Overlay as the relatively small size of the lot and the heritage control, will I fear create enormous problems in obtaining approval for future building works to bring the property to a high quality family home.  I understand the amendment would allow a greater site coverage with a planning permit, but urge a change to the amendment to include an acknowledgment that such a permit is supported where the lot is smaller and was created at an earlier time. I generally applaud the proposals to maintain lower density development, the height restrictions proposed and the encouragement of a vegetated environment.  I am also very supportive of the proposal not to extend the Barwon Heads town boundary.	South of Bridge Rd Settlement Boundary